EX LIBRIS
MARYGROVE

The Theology of the New Testament

NIHIL OBSTAT,
JOANNES GRAY
CENSOR DEPUTATUS

IMPRIMATUR
✠ HENRICUS EPUS TIPASEN.
VIC. CAP. ARCHID. S. ANDR. ET EDIMBURGEN.
EDIMBURGI
DIE 7 JULII, 1929.

L25
L54

Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge
V

The Theology of the New Testament

by
the Rev. Fr. Lemonnyer, O.P.
Professor at the Theological College of Le Saulchoir

Translated by
the Rev. W. A. Spence, M.A.

LONDON
SANDS & CO.
15 KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN

MADE AND PRINTED
IN GREAT BRITAIN

33
2

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION—

I Notion of the Theology of the N.T. - 9

II Various views concerning the Theology of the N.T. - - - - - 10

III Catholic conception of the Theology of the N.T. - - - - - 17

PART I

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND ITS FOUNDER

CHAPTER I—THE PREPARATION.

I Opinions on the function of John the Baptist - - - - - - 21

II The Messianism of John the Baptist - 23

III John the Baptist, the Forerunner of Jesus - - - - - - 27

CHAPTER II—THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

I Jesus the Preacher of the Kingdom - 31

II The Kingdom of God in Jewish thought 34

III The Kingdom of God in the Synoptics - 37

CHAPTER III—THE JUSTICE OF THE KINGDOM.

I Those who are called - - - 47

II The conditions of entrance into the Kingdom - - - - - 49

III Life in the Kingdom - - - 51

CHAPTER IV—THE FOUNDER OF THE KINGDOM.

I Jesus as the Messias - - - - 57

II Jesus as the Son of Man - - - 65

CONTENTS

PART II

THE NEW ECONOMY OF SALVATION

CHAPTER I—FROM THE STATE OF SIN TO THE STATE OF JUSTICE.

I St. Paul and the Revelation of Jesus Christ - - - - - - 73
II The dominion of sin - - - - - 76
III The justice of the Law - - - - 80
IV The justice of Faith - - - - - 84

CHAPTER II—INCORPORATION INTO CHRIST.

I Faith - - - - - - - 87
II Baptism - - - - - - - 96
III The Eucharist - - - - - - 102

CHAPTER III—THE NEW LIFE.

I The new man - - - - - - 107
II The virtues of the new man - - - 111
III The special graces of the new man - 116
IV The life of the new man - - - 121

CHAPTER IV—CHRISTIAN HOPE.

I The object of Christian hope - - 129
II The fulfilment of Christian hope - - 131
III The Reign of Christ - - - - - 134

PART III

THE PERSONALITY OF JESUS

CHAPTER I—THE LORD.

I Lord, as a title given to Jesus during His mortal life - - - - - - 138
II Lord, as a title of the Risen Christ in the Palestinian communities - - - 141
III Lord, as a title of the Risen Christ in St. Paul's writings - - - - - 143

CONTENTS

Chapter II—The Son of God.
I The Son of God, in the Synoptics - - 148
II The Son of God, in St. Paul - - - 150
Chapter III—Christ, in St. John.
I Christ the Light - - - - 154
II Christ the Life - - - - - 156
III The Father and the Son - - - 158
IV The Word - - - - - 162
Chapter IV—The Divine Trinity.
I The Trinitarian formulas - - - 169
II The Personality of the Holy Spirit - 171
III The relations among the Divine Persons 173
Bibliography - - - - - - 176

INTRODUCTION

SUMMARY: I. *Notion of the Theology of the N.T.*
II. *Various views concerning the Theology of the N.T.*
III. *Catholic conception of the Theology of the N.T.*

I. NOTION OF THE THEOLOGY OF THE N.T.

BY the New Testament we understand the collection of writings of which the Catholic Church has long since drawn up the official list, the Canon, and which it regards as relating, with an authority at once historical and divine in character, the life of Jesus Christ, the doctrine which He taught, and the religious institutions which He founded.

Now, it is just this—the life, the doctrine, the work of Jesus Christ, exactly as they are recorded in the writings of the N.T.—which constitutes the Theology of the N.T., of which we now propose to sketch the outlines, with, however, this very notable reservation—that in so far as the life of Jesus is concerned, it belongs to our subject only in its great dogmatic facts.

It is, perhaps, superfluous to call to mind that the Theology of the N.T., as a special subject of study, presupposes, as already accomplished, the criticism and exegesis, properly so-called, of the writings of the N.T. Of these preliminary tasks the reader will find the results in other volumes of this series.

Does the Theology of the N.T. present itself as a true unity? Or, even, simply, as a homogeneous whole?

Is it not customary to distinguish in it distinct elements, which are termed the Teaching of Jesus; the Faith and Worship of the primitive Church; Pauline theology; and Johannine theology? In so doing, is it not meant—at least very often—that we have in it so many well-marked doctrinal wholes, really different, more or less heterogeneous?

We have there a preliminary question which cannot be passed over.

II. Various Views concerning the Theology of the N.T.

For a hundred years non-Catholic criticism has never ceased to revolve in every direction this problem of the homogeneity of the Theology or Religion of the N.T., without succeeding in finding a solution to which it can adhere. The chief cause of its failure is that Hegelian conception of history which a critic who entirely accepts it, G. Bertram, has but lately stated in the following terms: "The problem of the origin of Christianity is an historical problem; which means that it demands a solution strictly immanent and drawn from the history of Evolution." This is required by Hegelian idealism, of which the ruling idea is that the order of things must be conformed to the pretended order of thought, in order to make it intelligible.

D. F. Strauss († 1874) will serve us as a starting-point in this epitomised account of the variations of non-Catholic criticism concerning the way in which the Religion of the N.T. should be apprehended. Moreover, his *Life of Jesus*—the two volumes of which appeared in 1835—does really mark a date. The myth of the Christ—that is for him the true subject of the books of the N.T. Not that he means that Jesus never existed; but that His

historical individuality is inaccessible to us. All that we know of Him is that His personality made so strong an impression upon His disciples that they projected upon Him, with the title itself, the attributes, the functions, the ideal image, of the Messiah. And in the writings of the N.T. we have, instead of the biography of the historical Jesus, only the late presentation of a myth—the myth of the Christ. In this sense their content is only too homogeneous.

This conception gave the impression of being excessively summary and by far too radical. F. C. Baur († 1860), who had been Strauss' master, without wholly repudiating it, judged it necessary to make distinctions and modifications. In his book on *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, published in 1845, he admits—but without concerning himself further—that Jesus Himself had presented Himself as the Messiah. For him, as for Strauss, the interest is centred on the primitive Church. In it he discerns two distinct and even opposing tendencies, which he calls Petrinism and Paulinism. The former is characterised by fidelity to the traditional Jewish Messianism, while the latter represents a Messianism which is spiritual and strongly denationalised. A third tendency, and this a conciliatory one, asserted itself little by little, and succeeded in securing the prevalence of a compromise, which was Catholicism. The writings of the N.T. reflect these diverse tendencies, and it is that which enables us to fix their relative, if not absolute, chronology. Those in which Petrinism is manifested are the oldest. Those which teach Paulinism come later. Those in which the Catholic compromise prevails are the most recent. Baur, then, shows us a certain original connection, on the ground of Messianism, between Christian thought and the historical teaching of Jesus, only to break up at once the unity of that thought itself. Besides, for him as for

Strauss, Christianity remains essentially the work of the primitive Church.

The determinations applied by Baur and the Tübingen school to the over-simplified thesis of Strauss seemed, in their turn, insufficient to the school known as Liberal. This school put forward its own point of view on the ground of the literary criticism of the writings of the N.T. It set out to distinguish among the Gospels those which were of value as sources for the critical history of Jesus. It persuaded itself to look to Mark for the facts, and for thought to that hypothetical collection of *Logia*, or Sayings, of Jesus, which it was accustomed to designate by the letter Q, the first letter of the word *Quelle*—Source. In relation to Mark-Q, witnesses in their respective manners to the primitive catechetical teaching, Matthew and Luke, who made use of them concurrently with other traditions and writings of less importance, would be secondary, and would possess but a very precarious historical value. However that may be, Jesus again became recognizable, thanks especially to Mark-Q, duly criticised and interpreted, and His personal teaching took its place again in the foreground of the Theology of the N.T. But in the very midst of this Theology, chiefly under the form of the Jesus-Paul dualism, arose new and deep-seated antitheses. The religion of Jesus, in fact, and the theology of Paul, were very different things. H. J. Holtzmann († 1910), with his classical work in two volumes on the *Theology of the N.T.* (1897), may be considered as the most systematic interpreter of these ideas.

However, towards the end of the nineteenth century and in the early years of the twentieth, a double attack was launched against the positions of the Liberal school. J. Weiss published at Göttingen, in 1892, his sensational essay on the *Preaching of Jesus with reference to the Kingdom of God.* In it he opposed his eschatological Messianism

to that moral and prophetical type of religion, dominated by the idea of the Fatherhood of God, to which A. Harnack, in his celebrated book on *The Essence of Christianity* (1900), had attempted to reduce the thought of Jesus. And he insisted on this idea, which was to become famous—that Jesus was a man of His time, Whose religious thought was expressed, or rather, was built up, in strict solidarity with that of His environment.

W. Wrede looked at the matter from another point of view. In his book on *The Messianic Secret in the Gospels* he took the line that Mark itself, in which the Liberal school thought that it had found the Jesus of history, was, like the other Gospels, entirely dominated by the belief of the primitive Community. The contrivance of the Messianic Secret—which he thought to have discovered—enabled Mark to give us, without openly clashing with the facts, a Messianic interpretation of a story which had not been of such a character.

Here we have a double reaction—moreover unacceptable in its results—of what must be called the positive and historical mind against the rational eclecticism and religious moralising of the Liberal school, now quite out of fashion. French Protestant exegesis, which had freely appropriated the ideas of Holtzmann and Harnack, experienced the effects of it. Quite recently again, M. Goguel, who would seem to be its most qualified representative, ranked the consequent eschatologism among the constituent elements of the personal teaching of Jesus. As to M. Loisy, he was among the first to take up the thesis of J. Weiss.

However, two new schools, still German, were to take up and extend the points of view of Weiss and Wrede.

The first styles itself the School of the History of Religion—historical to be understood in the Hegelian and evolutionary sense. L. de Grandmaison has expressed

in significant terms, in their practical bearing on historical matters, the philosophical postulates which inspire it. "The adherents of this school . . . hold that no real fact is conceivable which has not its entire reason for existence in anterior facts, immanent in our present world. Any superhuman, transcendent, supernatural intervention is thus banished from history."* However, it owes its specific character to the systematic use which it makes of the comparative method. Hence the name of Comparative School, which is often given to it.

For this school, just now very influential, Christianity represents little more than the crystallisation, round the Jesus of history, of a whole collection of elements which, as it were, existed in suspense in the spiritual atmosphere in the midst of which Jesus Himself and the first Christian communities lived. In the first rank among these elements must be placed what are called the mystery-cults, or, more shortly, the mysteries. What mysteries? It is not quite certain. All the mysteries of earlier Asia, of Egypt, and of Greece. Or rather, a dark and confused mysticism out of which arose the mystery of Jesus, Lord and Saviour, the essential factor of Christianity. By whose doing? More or less of everybody, of an anonymous crowd of folk and of some leading personalities, of communities of Jewish origin and of Hellenistic communities. Possibly, even, Jesus may have given a personal contribution. Without any attempt to give a list, we may be allowed to name among the initiators and directors of this movement of thought, W. Bousset († 1920), with his *Kyrios Christos* (1913), and above all, R. Reitzenstein, with his many works on the Iranian Mystery.

Some Comparatives, pushing the principles of the system to their extreme consequences, have gone so far

* L. de Grandmaison, *Jésus dans l'histoire et dans le mystère.* Paris. 1925. p. 18, *seq.*

as to deny the existence of Jesus. Dr. P. L. Couchoud, a pupil of M. Alfred Loisy, thought that he was able to determine that Christ and His heavenly mystery were the creation of a visionary, Paul of Tarsus. Transferred, in the Gospels, on to the historical plane, the mystery of Christ has there become the myth of Jesus, Who had no real existence.

While the Comparative School developed rather in the direction laid down by J. Weiss, the School of the history of tradition took the way opened up by Wrede. M. O. Cullmann recently expounded his scheme to the French public, in the *Review of Religious Philosophy and History*, published by the Protestant Faculty of Theology of Strasburg.* M. Dibelius, K. L. Schmidt, R. Bullmann, G. Bertram, etc., who represent it, agree on the following points. Before the Gospels, which are but a written version of it, comes an oral gospel, or rather, a popular religious tradition with reference to Jesus. In the bosom of this tradition arose various types of stories and sayings, in which, in accordance with the laws which govern this kind of collective activity, the discourses and real doings of Jesus underwent a profound alteration. Here some critics assert that there is no hope of ever being able to lay hold of the historical Jesus. For the most part the adherents of this new school are at the same time fervent advocates of the comparative method.

Up to now these two schools have, concerning the origin of the writings of the N.T., upheld in the main the conclusion, relatively sensible, to which it is the merit of the Liberal critics—and of M. Harnack in particular—to have given prevalence. M. Cullmann, for example, thinks it possible to restrict the formation of the "tradi-

* O. Cullmann, "Recent Studies on the Formation of the Evangelical Tradition," in the *Revue*, etc. 1925. pp. 459, 566, *seq.*, *seq.*

tion" from which the Gospels emerged to the thirty or forty years which separate the Synoptics from the death of Jesus. Already, however, peculiar opinions have begun to appear in this department of literary criticism. Thus, a collaborator of Dr. Couchoud, M. H. Delafosse, persists, in spite of the general scepticism that it meets with, in maintaining the thesis that our Pauline epistles, to mention these only, represent a late Catholic rearrangement of a Marcionite edition of the Apostle's writings.

Both the School of the history of tradition and the Comparative School admit, in the main, the homogeneity of the Theology of the N.T. But this homogeneity springs largely from the more or less radical elimination of what the Liberal School called the Religion of Jesus, which it opposed to the Pauline and Johannine Theology. For these schools there does not exist any clearly perceptible body of teaching on the part of Jesus, but merely a mystery or a theology of the Christ. A mystery, or mystical theology, we may say, for to the religious moralism of the past has succeeded a mysticism more or less non-moral. However, in this mystery of Jesus, Lord and Saviour—in which are combined elements from all kinds of sources—are still distinguished successive stages or even distinct systems—that of the primitive community, that of Paul, and that of John. All, nevertheless, be it repeated, have as their principle theme and their organic centre the idea of salvation and the Person of the Saviour-God, an idea and a Person by which, we are assured, the living faith of the Greco-Roman world was at that time nourished, from Persia to the Pillars of Hercules.

III. Catholic Conception of the Theology of the N.T.

To this flow and return of opinions Catholic historians of Christian origins no longer pay much heed. For the last fifty years Catholic science, thanks to its own labours and those of non-Catholic scholars, has made very great progress. Matured, on the other hand, through the Modernist crisis, it has become aware of the critical soundness of its positions. Without in the least despising the additional light thrown on history, which the interpretation of the writings of the N.T. owes to the use of the comparative method, nor that which may be expected from a more systematic study of the formation of the evangelical tradition, it has increasingly realised the growth of its own critical soundness in proportion with the development of its experience.

It maintains, then, without hesitation that in spite of differences of character in their writings, here rather narrative in style and there didactic, and in spite of the obvious diversity of their aims, as of their respective characteristic qualities, the teachings of the writers of the N.T. do compose a coherent whole. And for it, this coherence is not verified simply in the sphere of the religious thought of the primitive Church, but is dependent on the teaching and historical works of Jesus. It is, it declares, the revelation brought by Jesus Himself, and the economy of salvation established by Him, which, progressively assimilated and interpreted, under the safeguard of the Spirit of the Lord, by the leaders of the Christian community, form the subject of the books of the N.T. and the ingredients of their Theology.*

* cf. R. P. Allo: *Apologétique du N.T.*, in the *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*. 1927. p. 133, *seq.*

It is this Catholic notion which will regulate our exposition. We shall put aside, although they may be taken in an entirely acceptable sense, the usual distinctions : the teaching of Jesus; the faith and worship of the primitive community; the Pauline theology and the Johannine theology. Since we must have some division, let us seek one in more perceptible harmony with this governing idea—that the revelation which Jesus brought and the salvation accomplished by Him, supply the whole subject of the Theology of the N.T.

The writings of the N.T. divide themselves into three groups: the Synoptic Gospels, the Epistles of St. Paul with the Acts of the Apostles, and the Johannine writings. Now, at least if we consider matters somewhat generally, each of these groups presents to us the thought and work of Jesus under a particular aspect. Each has its theme—not exclusive, no doubt, but principal and characteristic. For the Synoptics it is the Kingdom of God and its Founder; for the Epistles of St. Paul it is the new economy of salvation; for the Johannine writings it is the Personality of Jesus Himself.

What adds interest to this consideration is that the three themes just stated correspond, still speaking generally, to the three stages by which the disciples of Jesus arrived at a full understanding of the Christian revelation. Nay, more ; they correspond to the economy of this revelation itself, which began with the preaching of the Kingdom, developed in the organisation of the scheme of salvation, and was consummated in the manifestation of the Personality of Jesus.

This gradual presentation of the revelation of Jesus in the three groups of writings which compose the N.T., from which we intend to derive the division of our exposition, must in no way be interpreted in an evolutionistic sense, as if it implied a real growth, still less a transformation, of the initial Delivery. So little is there

of anything like such an evolution, that the Epistles o St. Paul, specially consecrated to the second of our themes, are anterior, for the most part, to the Synoptics, of which our first theme forms the principal subject. The Fourth Gospel, in which the third theme is directly approached, is, if the latest in date of the writings of the N.T., none the less a Gospel which sets out to report the very words of Jesus.

Here we may be tempted to doubt the pertinence of our initial consideration. There is, however, no ground for such doubt, and for this reason. The Synoptic Gospels, though no doubt a little later than the great Pauline Epistles, do set out to report the preaching of Jesus in its plainest and most easily perceptible form. The Epistles, on the other hand, set forth a soteriology which, although already contained substantially in the preaching of Jesus, found its completion only with the death of the Master and the great events that followed it. The Fourth Gospel relates such of Jesus' teaching as was deeper and less perceptible at first sight. It is altogether the work of a privileged auditor, and of a contemplative who slowly assimilated the most intimate confidences of his Master.

We can, then, keep to the division we have in view. The three themes which it distinguishes do represent at once, for the disciples of Jesus, the three stages of their apprehension of the Christian revelation, and for Jesus Himself the three planes on which His divine training was exercised in His historic preaching and work. Consequently, this little book will be divided into three parts, of which the first will treat of the Kingdom or Realm of God, and of its Founder, especially according to the Synoptics ; the second of the new economy of salvation, especially according to St. Paul; and the third of the Personality of Jesus, especially according to St. John.

INTRODUCTION

When treating above of the various conceptions which non-Catholic historians of primitive Christianity present of the Theology of the N.T., we have made no reference to the view, widely spread among them, which rejects the term Theology as too intellectual and dogmatic, and substitutes for it those of Religion and Piety. This way of looking at the matter is specially significant when applied to St. Paul. It would take too long to draw out its equivocal character, namely, the arbitrary antithesis which it implies between Religion and Theology, and to criticise its false philosophical presuppositions. In the sketch which follows we hope to show that it is contrary to the facts.

PART I

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND ITS FOUNDER

CHAPTER I

THE PREPARATION

SUMMARY: I.—*Opinions on the function of John the Baptist.* II.—*The Messianism of John the Baptist.* III.—*John the Baptist, the Forerunner of Jesus.*

I.—OPINIONS ON THE FUNCTION OF JOHN THE BAPTIST

THE Gospels, including the Fourth, present the ministry of John as the immediate preparation for the ministry of Jesus, itself quite original. On this general principle, which is accepted substantially by everyone, non-Catholic criticism builds up its hypotheses, which result in more or less change of its character.

The opinion of M. Alfred Loisy, thoroughly radical, and representative of an attitude of mind of which M. Reitzenstein is the chief inspirer, is as follows:

"In the discourse attributed to him John declared himself to be the Forerunner of Christ, and he proclaimed beforehand, together with the merely symbolical character of his own baptism, the superiority of Christian baptism—a mystical rite by which is given the Holy Spirit. This is an apologetic invention to cover an awkward fact, namely, that the Christian sect and its

baptism start (and that by way of Jesus Himself) from John the Baptist, from his sect and his observance."

So far we have only an affirmation, gratuitous, but one formulated in intelligible language. What follows, and is meant to be a proof, is so concise that it becomes obscure. "The name of Nazerene, which was given to Jesus and to the Christians in Eastern countries, might be a memorial of this origin."* M. Loisy is apparently thinking of that sect of Mandean-Nasarenes of which the last survivors are to-day grouped in the region of the Lower Euphrates, and whose sacred books, together with the Manichean texts, have enabled M. Reitzenstein to resuscitate what he calls the Mystery, or Iranian Myth, of the First Man or Heavenly Man, the true type of the Saviour-God. The Mandeans, a Baptist sect, claim descent from John the Baptist, and M. Loisy seems to admit this pretension. And from this denomination, Nazarene-Nasarene, which he supposes to be common to Christians and Mandeans, he concludes that the former, as well as the latter, owe their origin to John the Baptist, whose disciple Jesus was. It is an instructive spectacle to see thus opposed to the perfect intelligibility of the accounts of the Gospels this string of obscure hypotheses, which the reader will find exactly set forth and judiciously criticised in a recent study by Père Lagrange.†

The opinion of M. M. Goguel has at least the merit of not trying to escape in this free and easy manner from the field delimited by the solid and concordant deliveries of the Gospels. "The baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist," he writes, "must not be conceived as a merely external contact, but as the proof of a relation between the primitive thought of Jesus and the Baptist move-

* A. Loisy, *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament.* Paris. 1922. p. 260.

† M. I. Lagrange: *La gnose mandéenne et la tradition evangélique*, in *Revue Biblique*, 1927: pp. 321, *seq.*, 481, *seq.* 1928: p. 5, *seq.*

ment. But already in the account of the baptism of Jesus appears the germ of a new orientation and of an original development. . . . What is to be retained of the primitive account is as follows: As one of the group around St. John Baptist, and while still sharing his views on the coming of the Messianic Kingdom, Jesus feels Himself to be called by God to a special mission (a subjective revelation transformed into an objective one, consequent on his baptism by John) with a view to the realisation of this Kingdom. The recognition of this mission was to lead Jesus to separate Himself from St. John the Baptist, and to create, alongside the movement inaugurated by him, a movement which was to be different in kind."* Since we have, in the case of M. Goguel, to deal with a particular interpretation of the deliveries of the Gospels—an interpretation influenced, in point of fact, by a religious philosophy too vague to enable one usefully to define and discuss it—we need, in our own turn, only examine the texts.

II.—The Messianic Teaching of John the Baptist

"John was in the desert baptizing and preaching the baptism of penance unto remission of sins" (Mark i, 4). Matt. iii, 1-2 gives us some idea of the content of this preaching: "And in those days cometh John the Baptist preaching in the desert of Judea. And saying: Do penance: *for* the kingdom of heaven is at hand." We find certain Rabbis of the succeeding age saying substantially: "Do penance *in order to* salvation." We find also St. Peter taking up this idea in his sermon to the Jews, after the curing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, (Acts iii, 19, *seq.*) These two formulas present conceptions

* M. Goguel, *La vie et la pensée de Jésus*, in *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*. 1925. p. 515.

of the Kingdom which differ perceptibly. For the Rabbis the Kingdom is essentially salvation, and can come only as such. For John the Baptist the Kingdom means at once salvation and perdition, and its coming is heralded by a judgment. John's conception is equivalent to that expressed in Isaias lvi, 1: "Keep judgment and do justice, *for* my salvation is near to come and my justice to be revealed." Although the idea of John and that of the Rabbis are equally of a moral character, John's is more fundamentally so, and less optimistic with regard to the future of Israel.

John's thought is more fully revealed in his apostrophe to the Pharisees and Saducees (Matt.) and to the multitudes (Luke): "Ye brood of vipers, who hath shewed you to flee from the wrath to come? . . . Every tree therefore that doth not yield good fruit shall be cut down and cast into the fire" (Matt. iii, 7, 10; Luke iii, 7, 9). The establishment of the Kingdom of God is, then, to be accompanied by a manifestation of the wrath of God, cleansing and pruning sinners from among the elect people, in spite of their being the children of Abraham (Matt. iii, 9; Luke iii, 8). And the mention of fire seems to show that John has in view the last judgment.

Fresh light is here shown on the Messiah and His work: "He"—in contrast with John—"shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and fire. Whose fan is in His hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse His floor: and gather the wheat into His barn, but the chaff He will burn with unquenchable fire" (Matt. iii, 11, *seq.*; Luke iii, 16, *seq.*). Here are two works, both Messianic, both concerned with the establishment of the Kingdom of God.

"He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and fire." That there is an allusion to the Christian rite of baptism seems clear from the antithesis: "I baptise in water." However, the thought must be taken to extend to more

than the simple rite of baptism and to suggest a complete phase of the development of the Messiah's activity. We find Jesus alluding later to this saying of John with reference to the coming of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost (Acts i, 5), and Peter himself interpreting that event as a realisation of the Messianic prophecy of Joel ii, 28, *seq.* (Acts ii, 16, *seq.*) John's words must, then, be taken to cover, in reality if not with his explicit intention, that phase of the Messiah's activity which is distinct from and precedes the cleansing of the threshing-floor.

The cleansing of the floor, with the operations which follow upon it, are to be taken to mean the last judgment and the final establishment of the Kingdom, of which it is the prelude. Judging from the contrast between the "barn" and "the unquenchable fire" (Gehenna), this relates to the Kingdom in the Heavens. Here are two planes of activity of which the first, that of the baptism in the Spirit, is clearly, in contrast with the other, terrestrial and historical. Both, however, the heavenly and eschatological plane, and the terrestrial and historical, seem to be set down in one and the same chronologically continuous perspective.

To characterise John's Messianic doctrine as wholly eschatological would be to risk a charge of equivocation. To be exact, nothing is to be found in the Baptist's conceptions beyond that traditional want of distinction between the chronological planes and that foreshortening of the perspective which had always been characteristic of the Messianic prophecies. It is of no use to adduce the message of surprise and impatience which John's disciples were to bring later to Jesus from their master (Matt. xi, 2, *seq.*; Luke vii, 19, *seq.*). Under what form, exactly, was Jesus, in the opinion of John and his followers, unduly delaying His self-revelation? As He Who baptizes in the Spirit and in fire? Or as He Who with

fan in hand cleanses His floor? There is nothing to shew which.

Moreover, John's asceticism does not exhibit what is called an eschatological mentality, that is to say, the intention, shown by a repudiation of its fashion of life, to break with a world judged to be doomed to disappear in a short time. It is true that John's asceticism made a great impression on his contemporaries, and that the Gospels depict it with approval. For Jesus Himself it supplied the subject of His great eulogy of John—Matt. xi, 7, *seq.* and the parallel passages. But what does it exactly represent? "He shall drink no wine nor strong drink," had been the message of the angel to his father Zachary (Luke i, 15). He was, then, to be a Nazarite? No, for we find him later eating locusts, which a Nazarite would not have done. To that food he adds wild honey, which he also finds in the desert. In short, this diet is to some extent imposed on him by reason of his retirement, and in itself may have no particular significance. On the other hand, John wore about his loins (Mark i, 6) a girdle of rough leather, such as that with which Elias had covered his nakedness in the days of old (IV Kings i, 8). To that he added a cloak woven of camel's hair, such as the prophets used to wear (Zacharias xiii, 4). If, then, we look at it closely, we find in John's life in the desert nothing more than the sensational reappearance of a thing that had long been abolished in Israel, namely, the fashion of existence and life of the great prophets. There was nothing eschatological in that.

Neither was there in the penance which he preached. In the line of behaviour which he laid down for the people, the publicans and the soldiers (Luke iii, 10), we recognise in all its purity the traditional spirit of the prophets.

The teaching and work of Jesus Himself will be found

to develop as a continuation of those of John. Where does M. Goguel find any proof that Jesus separated Himself from the Baptist, and that alongside the movement started by the latter He inaugurated another of a specifically different character? Jesus confined Himself, while beginning to carry out John's Messianic programme, to marking, with increasing exactness, the distinction between the two planes which it included, the one terrestrial and historical, the other eschatalogical and heavenly. Not, however, to such a degree as to escape on His own part the imputation of an eschatological tendency, with which a considerable number of modern critics charge him, and quite wrongly.

This, however, is true; there does really exist a radical difference between John and Jesus, which consists in this—that Jesus is the Messias and John His Forerunner.

III.—John the Baptist, Forerunner of Jesus

Jesus is presented as the emancipated disciple of John! Then He must have been John's disciple. Now, it is not at all in this character that we find Him in relation with John.

First let us see what idea John gives of his own character. In reply to the messengers from the Sanhedrin when they questioned him, he declared in successive answers that he was neither the Messias, nor Elias, nor the Prophet of Deuteronomy xviii, 15, who was more or less vaguely conceived as a character of the Messianic cycle. Urged to define his part in some way, he replied by quoting Isaias xl, 3: "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord." And the Synoptics, in each of which it is repeated, have, as it were, fixed this saying upon him (Mark i, 3; Matt. iii, 3; Luke iii, 4, *seq.*).

Now, before John's own account of the matter, others had declared the part assigned to him. First of all the angel who announced his birth: "He shall be great before the Lord . . . and shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb. And he shall convert many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God. And he shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias" (Luke i, 15, *seq.*).

Next, Zachary, in his Benedictus—a hymn pitched in a key so exquisitely right that that alone should be a guarantee of its authenticity, if such be needed—Zachary sang: "And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways" (Luke i, 76). We always find this last special feature of "going before the face of the Lord."

Finally, Jesus Himself is found confirming, on more than one occasion, these assertions about John (Matt. xi, 10; xvii, 10, *seq.*).

From these statements of John himself, or of others—and their agreement is striking—Christian tradition has derived as characterising John the Baptist the apt and graphic title of the Forerunner.

But of Whom, precisely, is John the Forerunner? From the language of the angel, from the Benedictus, the prophecy of Isaias, and from some sayings of John himself, we should be tempted to think of God in person. So, too, when we find such words as these: "And he (John) preached, saying: There cometh after me One mightier than I, the latchet of Whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and loose. I have baptized you with water; but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost" (Mark i, 7, 8, and the parallel passages). Now, it is Jahve Himself, Who, as we learn from Isaias xliv, 3; Joel ii, 28; Zacharias xii, 10, xiii, 1, pours out the Holy Spirit. John's formula (John i, 26): "There hath stood

One in the midst of you Whom you know not," and the rest as given by Mark, would rather suggest the idea of the Messias, the mention of whose name John seems to avoid.

Suddenly we perceive that the reference is in reality to Jesus, and we experience a kind of shock to find Him thus substituted for Jahve. At all events, it is He Who baptizes in the Holy Spirit: "I ought to be baptized by Thee, and comest Thou to me?" (Matt. iii, 13, *seq.*). The Fourth Gospel is quite explicit: "The next day, John saw Jesus coming to him: and he saith: Behold the Lamb of God. Behold Him Who taketh away the sin of the world. This is He of Whom I said: After me there cometh a Man Who is preferred before me: because He was before me. . . . And I knew Him not; but He who sent me to baptize with water said to me: He upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining upon Him, He it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw: and I gave testimony that this is the Son of God" (John 1, 29, *seq.*). Here we have, for the first time, the formal application to Jesus of one of the titles, Son of God, by which contemporary Judaism designated the Messias. John is, then, the Forerunner of Jesus, Who is the Messias. John knows this, and that in no way is he His master.

Once more does John explain himself, and in touching terms: In John iii, 22, *seq.*, we read: "After these things Jesus came into the land of Judea; and there he abode with them and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Ennon near Salim. . . . And there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews concerning purification. And they came to John and said to him: Rabbi, He that was with thee beyond the Jordan, to Who thou gavest testimony: behold, He baptizeth and all men come to Him. John answered and said: A man cannot receive anything unless it be given him from

heaven. You yourselves do bear me witness that I said I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before Him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth with joy because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase. but I must decrease."

John's conception of the situation and of his own part in relation to Jesus gives no ground whatever for thinking that Jesus Himself looked upon him as His master, or at any time behaved as John's disciple. If the expression of His desire, or better, of His will, to receive John's baptism is a motion of submission, yet it is made not to John, but to God, Who answered it in the way of which we know.

CHAPTER II

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

SUMMARY: I.—*Jesus the Preacher of the Kingdom.* II.—*The Kingdom of God in Jewish thought.* III.—*The Kingdom of God in the Synoptics.*

I. THE PREACHER OF THE KINGDOM

EVEN in the Synoptics may be observed the tendency to bring into the forefront of their account the Founder of the Kingdom. So we find that he who of all the evangelists seems to have most faithfully reproduced the historical physiognomy, or, if it be preferred, the material aspect of the facts, chooses as the heading of his book: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God"—i.e. of the Gospel which has Jesus Christ as its subject.

However, when we come to look into the matter more closely, we observe that in the account they themselves give, it was the Kingdom of God and not His own person which was the earliest subject of the preaching of Jesus. In this sense the remark of M. Loisy is true: "Jesus brings the message of God; he does not preach himself; He brings the good tidings which the Father sends to men, viz., that the time is fulfilled and the Kingdom at hand."*

According to Matt. iv, 17, Jesus at the opening of His ministry took up the formula of John's preaching: "Do penance, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." In Mark i, 15, however, we find what seems to be a more

* A. Loisy, *Les évangiles synoptiques.* Paris, I. 1907. p. 434.

exact expression of the new character which John's message could hardly fail to assume in becoming the gospel of Jesus: "The time is accomplished and the Kingdom of God is at hand. Repent and believe the gospel."

At every stage of His ministry the thought of Jesus is shown by the Synoptics as occupied with the Kingdom of God. To His disciples, as to the multitudes, He speaks of little else. In Matt. iv, 23, we read: "Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom." Still more categorically in Luke iv, 43: "To other cities also must I preach the Kingdom of God, for therefore am I sent" (cf. Luke i, 1, *seq.*).

It is His own message that He puts into the mouths of the Twelve when He gives them a share in His preaching: "The Kingdom of God is at hand" (Matt. x, 7; Luke x, 9, 11 and compare Mark vi, 11). He takes the same line a little later with the seventy-two disciples (Luke ix, 60, *seq.;* x, 1, *seq.*).

Still later, and shortly before His death, this great subject still holds its place in the mind and discourse of Jesus: "This gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in the whole world" (Matt. xxiv, 14). Finally, in Acts i, 3, we find Him appearing to His disciples after His resurrection, "and speaking of the Kingdom of God."

Again, to accentuate the predominance of this theme in the preaching of Jesus, Mark, above all, presents the Master to us as trying His utmost to divert from His own person, which fascinates them, the attention, curiosity and admiration of the attracted multitudes, whose fervour and enthusiasm obviously disquiet and embarrass Him. Not, doubtless, that He attempts to keep strictly hidden either His identity or the part He is to play; but these are not His first concern, and He

reserves to Himself their revelation at the proper time, and by carefully contrived degrees.

Moreover, the order which we find Him following in this gradual and discreet revelation of Himself is significant. He begins with His own character, which has a more immediate connection with the Kingdom. It is only later, or to a few privileged auditors, that He discloses the mystery of who He really is. His character is that of Founder of the Kingdom and Realm of God. The titles which He claims or receives in the Synoptics, Messias, and Son of David, Son of God, and Son of Man, Lord and Saviour, even when they give a more or less clear impression of exceeding its range, point directly to the Messianic order, and describe Jesus in relation to the Kingdom of God. A comparison of the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptics enables us to form an idea of the real economy of the revelation, and the exact order which Jesus observes in it. The Gospel of the Infancy, with its restraint and delicacy of tone, the Synoptic account of the public ministry, that of Mark in particular, in its completeness, the record of the Passion and Resurrection, the very accounts in the Acts of the Ascension and of the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit, all harmonize with the placing of the Kingdom of God first in the field of perspective and its Founder only in a secondary position. Even the miracles of Jesus, when they are not simply acts of mercy, were worked either to further the establishment of the Kingdom, or as His own credentials as its Founder. Such, for instance, is the case with those reported in Mark iii, 23, *seq.;* Matt. xii, 25, *seq.;* Luke xi, 17, *seq.;* and even those in Acts ii, 22, *seq.*, v, 29, *seq.*, x, 36; etc.

II.—The Kingdom of God in Jewish Thought

This Kingdom of God, which, according to the Synoptics, formed the first subject of the preaching of Jesus, held an equally important place in the religious thought of the Jews and in their expectations.

The ancient writings of the prophets and the later Jewish literature are full of proclamations of its coming and of its anticipated character. Indeed, it appears there under very different aspects, and in varieties of portraiture which it is often difficult to correlate. Père Lagrange has done his best to reduce this confusion to order. From him we borrow the substance of our analysis.*

The Kingdom of God is presented to us in the canonical books of the O.T. under two forms, not opposed, but rather complementary, yet distinct, and that by their very origin; the one is that of Jahve, King and Saviour of Israel, the other that of Jahve, King of the whole world. Before the Exile we find the former asserted; after the Exile it is the latter which prevails, but as including with itself the former. "The first appellation," writes Fr. Lagrange, "is the more familiar, and is the outcome of an historical experience; the second, and more majestic, is the fruit of reflection. The later writings started in the new fashion, but they could not neglect the promises of salvation to come contained in the old. God's eternal rule in the world was, by its very nature, unchangeable and still the same, but it was well known that Jahve had promised to save Israel. Thus the historical notion of salvation penetrated the philosophical notion of the divine monarchy, and the universal extension of this monarchy widened the

* M. J. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*. Paris. 1909. *Le Règne de Dieu dans l'A.T.*, in *Revue Biblique*. 1908.

promise of salvation; for the King of the world, in order to render His rule really effectual, must reign over all men.

"On the other hand, the hope of the divine assistance which Jahve was to grant to His people was founded upon His mercies of old and in His present dwelling among those who were His. Neither was the eternal Kingdom separated by any positive break from an operation strictly continuous, nor did the expected Kingdom belong entirely to the future. Neither the invincible power of the Saviour, nor the omnipotence of the King, was a new factor; what was expected was only the exercise of that power and the recognition of that might. It still held good that His intervention would be in favour of Israel, and since He was King of the world, that could come about only by means of some theophany which would oblige the nations to pay homage to Him. Not that this theophany was to be the end; far from it—it could be more truly said that the Kingdom of God was then to begin. This Kingdom—which is nowhere represented in the O.T. as established on the ruins of the world—may be called, in a broad sense, the Messianic Kingdom."

Such, then, is in its subtle complexity the notion of the Kingdom of God with which, as we see, the revelation of the Old Testament ends.

We re-discover the idea of the Kingdom of God in the abundant and varied post-biblical literature of the apocalypses and rabbinical writings. It appears, on the whole, in lower relief than we might expect, and to some extent again in its original dualism. Sometimes it is the eternal, and therefore actually existing, Kingdom of Jahve, the King of the world, which meets us; sometimes it is the historical, and therefore expected, Kingdom of Jahve, the King of Israel. It is clearly held that this latter Kingdom, which is but a particular realisation

of the former, is to be developed on earth. Sometimes the establishment of the Kingdom is accompanied by widespread catastrophes; sometimes it is presented to us as a mere development, with no overthrow of the existing state of things. As a result, when we look at the matter closely, we find very noticeable variations, which we shall have to emphasize later, when we deal with the Messias.

For the time being we must content ourselves with marking the late appearance, in the canonical books of the O.T., of a third conception of the Kingdom of God. This time we have to do with a Reign over the elect in the Hereafter. This idea of a transcendent and heavenly Kingdom, linked with that of a resurrection, assumes a position of considerable importance in the rabbinical literature as well as in the apocalypses.

This being so, it is difficult not to criticise as somewhat summary the following remarks of M. Goguel: "Nowhere (in the Synoptics) is the notion of the Kingdom of God defined, so common was it in the circles in which Jesus moved. By its origin it belongs to the old conception, at once national and theocratic, of the Kingdom of Israel. It arose at that period when after the loss of Israel's political independence the most resolutely optimistic interpretation of the situation was unable to contemplate its re-establishment by the natural march of events. Since, on the other hand, the indefectible expectation of Israel would allow of no abdication of its claims, there remained only one possible solution, the transference of Jewish hopes to the transcendent sphere. There was no longer the expectation of a Kingdom of Israel about to be re-established by the process of events, but the arrival of an entirely new economy, by which would be brought about the restoration of the sovereignty of God, hindered by the domination in the

world, not of the Chosen People, but of its enemies."* And since Jesus shared, of course, this eschatological conception of the Kingdom, upon which everyone in Israel was agreed, all that remains is to rediscover it in the Gospels. But this pretended agreement, thus raised to the rank of a principle of evangelical exegesis, has not, as we have seen, any real existence.

III.—The Kingdom of God in the Synoptics

So far is it from being the case that the idea of the Kingdom of God is purely and simply pre-supposed in the Synoptics, and is not made the subject of any further enlightenment, that we find in them Jesus fully occupied with forming it in the minds of His hearers on the model of His own thought, which we feel does not altogether coincide with theirs. It cannot, then, be said that He never defined it. In abstract form, evidently He did not, nor was it His way to do so. But as regards the Kingdom, our difficulty lies much more in the multiplicity of the definitions proposed to us, than in the absence of definition.

Subtly complex as was, in Jewish thought, the notion of the Kingdom of God, we are given the impression, at first sight, that it was no less so in the teaching of Jesus. M. Goguel does not disagree. "Is the Kingdom of God," he asks, "in the thought of Jesus, a reality of the spiritual order, an altogether interior thing and actually present, which frees man from all oppression by evil by fostering within him a form of life which makes him inaccessible to suffering in all its forms? Or should it, rather, be thought of as a future reality—as a state which will be established at a given moment by a sovereign act of intervention on the part of God? Or

* M. Goguel, *La vie et la pensée de Jésus*, in the *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*. 1925.

again, are we not to take the Kingdom of God as a thing at once present and to come? Present, in the sense of actual existence already in the hearts of the disciples as a germ destined to develop and to expand—to come, because it must await for its full expansion a distant future, perhaps at the end of the present period of development?"

Let us take note of these assertions, and without arguing about the precise signification of the terms in which he expresses them, let us emphasize M. Goguel's acknowledgment that the Synoptics afford a sufficient authorization of these different hypotheses. The Liberal school gives its vote to the first interpretation; the Eschatological school to the second; Catholic exegesis adopts the third, which alone seems to it to take into account the diversity of the evangelical deliveries. Further, it considers it necessary to widen its interpretation, in order to make room for the Church, of which M. Goguel takes no notice. As a matter of fact, Jesus was so far from considering the Kingdom of God as a simple thing and known to all, that He treats it as a "mystery" (Mark iv, 11; Matt. xiii, 11; Luke viii, 10). There can be no doubt the three Synoptics, who have all alike recorded this saying of the Lord, held it to be very much to the point.

As we know, the Greek word *basileia* may mean both Kingship and Realm.* We shall show without room for doubt that in the Synoptics it covers both senses, according to the requirements of the case. Mark and Luke speak of the Kingship and the Realm of God; Matthew conforms to the rabbinical usage, and, out of reverence for the divine Name, writes "of Heaven" instead of "of God."

And now we proceed, in such order and with such exactness as we can, to take stock rapidly of the Synoptic deliveries.

* *Règne et Royaume.*

THE KINGDOM* IN HEAVEN.—This makes its appearance, with all the clearness we can desire, in the Beatitudes in Matt. v, 3-10, more precisely in the first and eighth, illuminated as they are, and with them the rest also, by the saying reported in verse 12: "Rejoice . . . for your reward is very great in heaven" (cf. Luke vi, 20, *seq.*). It reappears in Matt. v, 19, *seq.* We will quote verse 20 only: "For I tell you that unless your justice abound more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." Here the sense of Realm, and not that of Kingship, is particularly plain.

In Matt. xiii, 40, *seq.*, the Kingdom of Heaven receives the just "at the end of the world," while the wicked are thrown "into the furnace of fire."

Here we have a transcendent Kingdom, brought before us in an eschatological context. In the same way, as regards the Kingdom of God, see Mark ix, 42, *seq.*, where it has as an equivalent "life," and as a contrast "Gehenna" (cf. Matt. v, 29, *seq.;* xviii, 7, *seq.*). In Matt. xix, 23, to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven is equivalent to "being saved" (cf. Mark x, 23, *seq.*, and Luke xviii, 24, *seq.*).

The way into this Kingdom, in which is enjoyed an eternal banquet (Matt. viii, ii; Luke xiii, 29) is through the resurrection (Matt. xxii, 30; and cf. Mark xii, 25, and Luke xx, 36), and at the time of the parousia (Matt. xxv, 1, *seq.*), after a solemn judgment (Matt. xxv, 31, *seq.*), Jesus will drink anew the fruit of the vine with His own (Matt. xxvi, 29; Mark xiv, 25).

The risen just will there lead the lives of angels (Matt. xxii, 30); they will shine as the sun (Matt. xiii, 43); they will enjoy perfect felicity (Matt. v, 3, *seq.;* Luke vi, 20, *seq.*).

This is quite distinctly and perceptibly the Reign†

* *Royaume.* † *Règne.*

of God over His elect in heaven of the apocalypses and rabbinical literature—a transcendent and eschatological Reign. But the Kingdom* of God in heaven, considered in itself, is supposed to exist already, and to have existed always.

THE KINGDOM† ON EARTH.—This is much more complicated.

(a) *The present Kingdom.*—When Jesus began his preaching he took up, as we have seen, St. John the Baptist's formula: "The Kingdom of God is at hand." We are struck by its admirable conciseness and energy. M. Loisy makes this very true remark upon it: "John the Baptist did not preach the Gospel. He did not preach directly the arrival of the Kingdom of God; he preached a baptism of repentance in view of the Kingdom which was about to come. Jesus also calls men to repent, but more especially he proclaims the Kingdom, and the repentance that he preaches is less a preparation for the Kingdom than an introduction into it. For the Kingdom is now so near as to be within reach, and he who believes in the 'good news,' on the proclamation of the Kingdom, is already in a manner actually within this Kingdom." Of this we have proof positive in Matt. xii, 28, and Luke xi, 20, in which we find the formula, "The Kingdom is at hand," changed quite naturally into, "The Kingdom is come upon you."

It is likewise impossible to doubt that the Kingdom of God, that is, as we must take it here, the Realm of God, does represent a reality on earth, present and perceptible (Matt. xi, 10, *seq.*, and Luke vii, 28, and xvi, 16). We read in Luke: "Amongst those that are born of women there is not a greater than John the Baptist. But he that is the lesser in the Kingdom of God is greater than he. . . . The law and the prophets

* *Royaume.* † *Règne.*

were until John. From that time the Kingdom of God is preached, and everyone strives to enter into it."* But, as M. Dibelius observes, here is the Church already, and he promptly proceeds to doubt the authenticity of vii, 28. Père Lagrange replies that the very difficulty of the saying is an excellent security for it.

Since we cannot quote all, we will at least transcribe the words of Jesus reported in Luke xvii, 20, *seq.:* "And being asked by the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God should come, He answered them and said: The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say: Behold here, or behold there. For lo, the Kingdom of God is within you." That is, not exactly in your hearts, but within Israel, in the midst of you. Whence we must conclude that the Kingdom of which Jesus is speaking here does not, in itself, represent a material and substantial quantity, nor that it is established amid eschatological catastrophes. Nevertheless, it is not merely an interior thing, since it is also a Realm.

(b) *The Kingdom to come.*—The second petition of the Lord's Prayer is as clear as could be wished: "Thy Kingdom come" (Matt. vi, 10; Luke xi, 2). Perhaps, however, the reference here is to the Kingdom or Realm in heaven? A careful observation of the strict parallelism in the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer is sufficient to exclude this interpretation: "Hallowed be Thy Name; Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." *On earth*—the determination is formal, and applies equally to the Kingdom.

It is hardly possible to miss the emphasis in the passage oft his equivalence (which throws light on its religious and spiritual nature) of the Kingdom of God on earth and the hallowing of the divine Name, with the accomplishment of the divine Will.

* *Eng. Version:* "everyone useth violence towards it." [Trans.]

This coming of the Kingdom might be taken to mean the progressive and regular development of the Kingdom already in being, and we shall see that the parables warrant such an interpretation. But here comes in another matter, which cannot be fitted in without serious difficulty. We allude more particularly to the saying which has been preserved for us, with some variations, in Matt. xvi, 28; Mark viii, 39; and Luke ix, 27.

Mark gives it thus: "And he said to them: Amen I say to you that there are some of them that stand here who shall not taste death, till they see the Kingdom of God coming in power." Some only; the others, the greater number, it would seem, being by then dead. The language of Jesus points to the last years of the generation to which He and the Twelve belonged. This coming of the Kingdom must represent something positive and determined. But what? The phrase "in power" suggests the idea of the parousia (cf. Matt. xxiv, 30; Mark xii, 26; Luke xxi, 27). And we have the same reference in Mark viii, 38: "The Son of man also will be ashamed of him, when He shall come in the glory of His Father with the holy angels." Does this mean that Jesus was announcing the eschatological coming of the Kingdom of God—and that, apparently, a Kingdom on earth—before the disappearance of the generation to which he belonged?

But here, without departing from the context, two observations must be made. First: in verse 38 of chap. viii the subject is the coming of the Son of man, and in verse 39 the coming of the Kingdom. If these are the same thing, why this diversity of terms? Again, Mark, by the repetition of the phrase "And he said to them" seems as if he meant to separate the saying in verse 39 from the warning which precedes it. In Luke ix, 27, where no such intention appears, we notice, on the other hand, the omission of "in power." In Matt. xvi,

28, the saying is reported in a different form: "Amen I say to you, there are some of them that stand here that shall not taste death till they see the Son of man coming in His Kingdom." It is not now the Kingdom that comes, but the Son of man. He comes in His Realm (rather than in His Kingship)—in His Kingdom which is supposed to be already in existence. Moreover, Matthew, like Luke, omits the expression "in power." All this, though it does not clear up our difficulties, is sufficient to put us on our guard against drawing hasty conclusions.

The saying in question needs to be studied in a wider context. We shall come to it again when we deal with the Son of man. But at this point it is well to compare it with the long discourse, termed eschatological, in which we shall find—especially in Matt. xxiii, 36, and xxiv, 34; Mark xiii, 30; Luke xxi, 32—that there are several parousias or comings of the Son of man, of which one, and that the chief one, is eschatological, and the other (or others) remains on the plane of history. It is to an historical coming, coinciding with the fall of Jerusalem, that the texts already quoted refer, and they determine the epoch in the same terms as are to be found in Mark viii, 39, and the parallel passages. In the eschatological discourse we notice the same substitution of the Kingdom for the Son of man that we have pointed out in reference to the saying we have been dealing with. St. Luke writes in xxi, 31, still with reference to the fall of Jerusalem: "So you also, when you shall see these things come to pass, know that the Kingdom of God is at hand."

Such being the case, the saying on the coming of the Kingdom in power can but point to a special development of the Kingdom of God on earth, of the Kingdom already existing—a development bound up with the disappearance of the Jewish nation. We are concerned with an event which is not eschatological, but belonging to history, and of great religious importance.

The Kingdom of God is already in existence. But since it is destined to undergo great developments, gradual or sudden, it may be said of it that it is still to come. In either case, we have not to do with the Kingdom in heaven, but with the Reign and Realm on earth.

(c) *The Church.*—The *basileia* of God on earth is, at once, interior or in man's hearts, and exterior or in the world. As interior it is rather a Reign, as exterior rather a Realm. We have met with both senses—Reign and Realm*—in the texts which have just been considered.

Now, then, the Kingdom (Realm) appears in Matt. xvi, 18, *seq.*, under the form of a "Church," that is, of an organised and public society. Since the publication, in 1918, of M. Harnack's sensational study, hardly anyone will venture to contest the authenticity of this celebrated saying. Compared to a building the Kingdom-Church has Cephas as its foundation; cf. Eph. ii, 20. Likened to a King's palace it has Peter as its steward; cf. 1 Cor. iv, 1, *seq.* Opposed to the City of the Devil it is the City of God, impregnable, against which the assaults of the powers of hell cannot prevail. This antagonism is found again in many places in the Gospels—Matt. xii, 25, *seq.;* Mark iii, 23, *seq.;* Luke x, 18; John xii, 31; xvi, 11, etc. In the saying in Matthew the verbs are in the future tense. But it is concerned with an immediate future, and Matt. xviii, 17, speaks of the Church in the present.

In connection with this Kingdom-Church we find the organisation of a public governmental authority. In Matt. xviii, 18, the power of binding and loosing, already conferred upon Peter as Supreme Head, is extended to others, who are called "the disciples," and who cannot be other than the Twelve, already organised as a special College. In Luke xxii, 31, Peter receives

**Règne et Royaume.*

the confirmation of his pre-eminent authority in a new sphere, and in respect of his colleagues themselves: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted (after the three-fold denial) confirm thy brethren." After the Supper, Jesus grants to the Twelve the power to reproduce the sacred action that He has just accomplished, or better, has instituted, in memorial of His redemptive death, and which is the key-stone of the whole Christian sacramental edifice (Luke xvii, 19; 1 Cor. xi, 24, *seq.*). To the Twelve again (Matt. xxviii, 18; Mark xvi, 15, *seq.*), He gives this commission: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." (This was after the Resurrection.) "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."

We could not wish for a more explicit affirmation of the universality, the perpetuity, "even to the consummation of the world," or age (this present world), of the commission of the Apostles to the administration of the Kingdom-Church. We shall have occasion later to notice the co-operation of the Paraclete promised to them in the accomplishment of their mission. John xx, 21, has preserved for us this other saying of Jesus to the Apostles: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you . . . . Receive the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain they are retained." And, finally, in John xxi, 15, *seq.*, we find these words by which is confirmed the peculiar authority of Peter: "Feed My lambs. . . . Feed My sheep."

THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM.—In the parables of the Kingdom we have a kind of synthesis of the instructions of Jesus on the Reign and Realm of God. By the parables of the Kingdom we mean those which open with the formula, "The Kingdom of heaven (or of God) is like to . . . ." Such are the parables of the Good Seed and the Cockle (Matt. xiii, 24, *seq.*); of the Grain of Mustard-seed (Matt. xiii, 31, *seq.;* Mark xv, 30, *seq.*); of the Leaven (Matt. xiii, 33); of the Treasure (Matt. xiii, 44); of the Pearl (Matt. xiii, 45, *seq.*); of the Net (Matt. xiii, 47, *seq.*); of the Seed which springs up and grows unnoticeably (Mark iv, 26). But there are many other parables which, though they do not open with this conventional formula, have, none the less, the Kingdom as their true theme; for example, the fine parable of the Sower, in Matt. xiii, 4, *seq.*, and in the parallel passages. There are, indeed, very few, if any, which are without some reference to this principal subject of the preaching of Jesus.

A detailed and methodical analysis, which we cannot undertake, as it would take us too far afield, would enable us to trace in these parables, often with a striking exactness, the whole series of doctrinal subjects which we have set forth above. We should find again the Kingdom in heaven, and the Kingdom on earth; the Kingship which is chiefly in men's hearts, and the Realm which is in the world. We should see the inauguration of the Kingdom, its gradual growth, and its consummation within the pale of the Kingdom-Church, the organisation of which is very sharply marked. We should there discern the present condition of the Reign and Realm, and its future absorption, at the end of the world and after the judgment, into the Kingdom in heaven. We should perceive that the Reign and Realm on the earth represent realities of a transcendent order, and that both their origin and their destiny, their hidden essence and their visible organisation, bind them mysteriously to God through Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER III

THE JUSTICE OF THE KINGDOM

SUMMARY: I.—*Those who are called.* II.—*The conditions of entrance into the Kingdom.* III.—*Life in the Kingdom.*

I.—THOSE WHO ARE CALLED

IT is the Jews who, in the first place, are called "the children of the Kingdom" (Matt. viii, 12). Nay, more, the personal and historical mission of Jesus concerns them specially, and directly them alone. Matt. xv, 24: "I was not sent but to the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel." This is to be understood of His mission as Preacher of the Kingdom. The helpers themselves whom He calls to His side, during His lifetime and in the accomplishment of His own task, are requested to confine themselves within the same limits: "Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles and into the city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go ye rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. x, 5).

Nevertheless, the Gentiles are also called, though only in the second place. The Gospel of the Infancy echoes in this respect the voice of the prophets of old (Luke i, 79; ii, 32); and at the other end of the Gospel account is heard the great command: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations." In the intervening account significant facts and sayings are not wanting. The saying, too, recounted in John x, 16, presents no difficulty: "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold [of Israel]; them also I must bring. And they shall hear my voice

[in that of my messengers]: and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

On the plane of actual fact is, indeed, effected a complete reversal, which very soon brings the Gentiles to the forefront. The Gospel narrative recounts the successive phases of Israel's great refusal, which, as a nation, it opposes to the repeated appeals of Jesus, and relates His complaints, His warnings, and finally His sentence of condemnation (Matt. viii, 11, 12). "And I say to you that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven: But the children of the Kingdom [the Jews] shall be cast into the exterior darkness." These words were addressed to the Jews, and perhaps cannot be fairly taken generally apart from its context: "For many are called, but few are chosen." Matthew (xxiii, 37) and Luke (xiii, 34) tell us how Jesus sighed: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . how often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldest not? Behold, your house shall be left to you desolate." And in the parable of the wicked husbandmen he goes so far as to say that the Kingdom shall be delivered over to others (Matt. xxi, 43).

When he is about to leave them, Jesus likewise outlines the programme of the evangelization of the world which He entrusts to them: "You shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts i, 8). Thus in the divine call, and in respect of the Gospel message, Israel comes first. To this St. Peter alludes in his sermon at Pentecost, Acts ii, 39: "For the promise is to you and to your children [in the first place] and [secondly] to all that are far off [the Gentiles], whomsoever the Lord our God shall call." But when Israel persists in its refusal, the gospel of the Kingdom, which

has become the gospel of salvation, passes definitely to the Gentiles; and St. Paul explains, in Rom. ix-xi, how this rejection of Israel, which is neither entire nor final, is consistent with God's faithfulness.

So Jesus had said: "And behold they are last that shall be first; and they are first that shall be last" (Luke xiii, 30).

II.—The Conditions of Entrance into the Kingdom

Of these we have already noticed two (Mark i, 15), which are fundamental: "*Repent* and believe the Gospel." Quite at the end, after the Resurrection, we find them stated as follows: "He that believeth and *is baptized* shall be saved" (Mark xvi, 16; cf. Acts ii, 38). The old Johannine connection between repentance and baptism still holds. Christian baptism, too, is in its own way a baptism of repentance. It is this that explains the difficult utterance in Heb. vi, 4, *seq.*: "For it is impossible for those who were once illuminated [baptized] . . . and are fallen away to be renewed again to [baptismal] penance." Baptism is not repeated.

Most suggestive as to the conditions of entrance is the utterance of Jesus reported in Matt. xviii, 3 and Mark x, 15: "Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child shall not enter into it." This, it would seem, refers to a certain quality of faith.

But now we learn that there are, as it were, privileged candidates for the right of entry into the Kingdom. Jesus declares to the Scribes and Pharisees: "I am not come to call the just, but sinners" (Matt. ix, 13, and parallel passages). The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican—the Pharisee whose prayer exhales his proud self-complacency, and the Publican who humbly beats his breast before God, and whom God justifies—enables

us to see the reason of this privilege. The context, however, might lead us to take this mention of the just and of sinners in the somewhat conventional and exterior sense given them by the Pharisees. Here, then, comes most opportunely another saying of Jesus to set us right: "Amen I say to you that the publicans and the *harlots* shall go into the Kingdom of God before you" (Matt. xxi, 31). The harlots! The sinners referred to are real sinners; and this is confirmed by many narratives and parables, among which it will be sufficient to cite the story of the Penitent Woman who was a sinner, given in Luke vii, 36-50. Only it must be granted that the just who have no interest for Jesus are positively the pretended just of the pharisaic type. This, rightly understood, is in no way inconsistent with Jesus being "the friend of publicans and sinners" (Matt. xi, 19)—Jesus, Who, leaving in the desert the ninety and nine, goes to seek the hundredth lost sheep (Luke xv, 3, *seq.*).

Other categories of privileged souls, perhaps less surprising, come into view. The poor, certainly. In Matt. xix, 23, and the parallel passages, we find a declaration, which by an inverse implication suggests their advantage: "Amen, I say to you that a rich man shall hardly enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." Witness the refusal of the rich young man, of which this text points the moral. The humble, too, and the little ones: "And whosoever shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in Me. . . ." (Mark ix, 41), where the expression, "these little ones," denotes the disciples of Jesus. Again, we may refer to the great saying reported in Matt. xi, 25, *seq.*, and Luke x, 21, *seq.*: "I confess to Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them to little ones." Lastly, all who may know themselves referred to in the touching words: "Come to Me, all you that labour and are bur-

dened: and I will refresh you." In short, all those traditional adherents of the God of Israel whom Jesus blesses with respect of the Kingdom: the poor, the meek, those who weep, they that hunger and thirst after justice, then, for their sake, their friends and protectors; the merciful, the clean of heart, the peacemakers, they that suffer persecution for justice' sake. Heirs of the Kingdom in heaven, they are pre-eminently the children of the Kingdom on earth (Matt. v, 3, *seq.*).

Everyone knows the fine passage in I Corinth. i, 26, *seq.*, and St. Paul's joyous affirmation of the truth that the reality corresponds to the assurances of Jesus. "For see your vocation, brethren, that there are not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble. But the foolish things of the world hath God chosen, that He may confound the wise: and the weak things of the world hath God chosen that He may confound the strong. And the base things of the world and the things that are contemptible, hath God chosen: and things that are not, that He might bring to nought things that are: That no flesh should glory in His sight. But of Him are you in Christ Jesus, Who is made unto us wisdom and justice and sanctification and redemption: That, as it is written: *He that glorieth may glory in the Lord.*" Note that St. Paul does not mention sinners, who are found in every class.

III.—Life in the Kingdom

"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice" (Matt. vi, 33). The justice of the Kingdom is the scheme of life in the Kingdom. It is a vast subject, and we can do little more than notice its chief features.

The New Wine.—With this picturesque term does Jesus describe the justice of the Kingdom (Mark ii, 22, and the parallel passages). He contrasts it sharply with

the justice of the Pharisees—the old bottle which the new wine would burst (Mark ii, 22, *seq.*, and the parallel passages). This distinction affords Him the opportunity of stating, by way of contrast, certain fundamental characteristics of the new justice, which is a justice of "the heart" (Matt. xv, 10, *seq.*, and the parallel passages); it is founded on humility and simplicity (Matt. vi, 1, *seq.*, and the parallel passages); it is honest and sincere (Matt. xv, 2, *seq.*); attainable by all and prudent in its practice (Mark vii, 3, *seq.*); perfectly compatible with the ordinary manner of life, as the example of Jesus testified (Matt. xi, 18, *seq.*, and the parallel passages).

In the same way the justice of the Kingdom is differentiated from the justice of the Law. But here the meaning of Jesus is more difficult to grasp. The Master had said: ". . . Unless your justice abound more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v, 20). This is repeated by implication when He deals with the justice of the Law (Matt. v, 21, *seq.*). But between the two cases there is a capital difference. The justice of the Kingdom surpasses that of the Pharisees without including it, for the latter is unreal. On the other hand, it surpasses the justice of the Law by fulfilling it, and by exalting and extending its range. "Do not think that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. v, 17). He even adds: "He therefore that shall break one of these least commandments and shall so teach men shall be called the least in the Kingdom of heaven. But he that shall do and teach, he shall be called great in the Kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v, 19, *seq.*). But, as Père Lagrange remarks, this Law is no longer the Mosaic Law in its material content and its old spirit, "but the Law of God in its fulness that Jesus has realised."* This is, doubtless, the meaning of

* *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu*, p. 96.

this utterance, which carries us far indeed to St. Paul's doctrine on the Law, although it is formulated from a point of view and in terms which are in no way Pauline: "The law and the prophets were until John. From that time the Kingdom of God is preached" (Luke xvi, 16). The justice of the Kingdom is one thing, the justice of the Law is another.

THE LAW OF CHARITY.—To the scribe who asks, "Which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus replies, "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart.*" But He adds, on His own part: "The second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Matt. xxii, 37, *seq.*). This second commandment becomes Jesus' own commandment, and He gives to it, in the justice of the Kingdom, a range in practice and a religious value which are really new: "A new commandment I give unto you: That you love one another, as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another" (John xiii, 34, *seq.*).

A whole series of instructions are given to set out in detail the dispositions and acts which this love demands. Especially significant are the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke x, 30, *seq.*); the sermon, on loving one's enemies (Matt. v, 43, *seq.*, Luke vi, 27, *seq.*), and on the forgiveness of injuries (Matt. viii, 21, *seq.*); and that on works of charity, as the matter of the last judgment (Matt. xxv, 31, *seq.*).

The precept to love God itself assumes a practical bearing which is quite new. We notice this especially in the stress which Jesus lays on the idea of the divine Fatherhood, which becomes one of the essential factors of life in the Kingdom. From this springs an entire course of the psychology of sonship. The justice of the Kingdom consists in a filial imitation of God: "Be you

therefore perfect [Luke has 'merciful'] as also your heavenly Father is perfect [merciful]." (Matt. v. 48; Luke vi, 36.) A constant intercourse of confident prayer grows up between the children of God and their Father, which witnesses to their complete reliance upon His Providence, and frees them from earthly cares (Matt. vi, 6, *seq.*; Luke xi, i, *seq.*; Matt. vi, 25, *seq.*; Luke xii, 22; Mark xi, 22; etc.).

The Office of Jesus.—The formula which St. Paul is found using later to describe the new life—life in Christ Jesus—arises spontaneously in the mind of anyone who tries to grasp the justice of the Kingdom in its concrete reality and its practical terms. That a very close relationship exists between the children of the Kingdom and Jesus is manifested continually, and under a great variety of forms, to which we can only just refer. We have the "confession" of the Son of man (Matt. x, 32; Luke xii, 8); prayer in the name of Jesus (Matt. xviii, 20, *seq.*; John xv, 16; xvi, 23, *seq.*); love of Jesus (Luke vii, 47; Matt. xix, 29, etc.; John xv, 9, *seq.*); ministering to Jesus by ministering to one's neighbour (Matt. xxv, 31, *seq.*, etc.). Above all there is the imitation of Jesus, and especially in this characteristic form: "He that taketh not up his cross and followeth Me is not worthy of Me. He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that shall lose his life for Me shall find it" (Matt. x, 38, 39; and cf. Matt. xvi, 24; Mark viii, 34; Luke ix, 23; xiv, 27).

The ideal of the justice of the Kingdom finds its loftiest expression in the Beatitudes (Matt. v, 3, *seq.*; Luke vi, 20, *seq.*). These we have interpreted above as calling into the Kingdom on earth, in their capacity of privileged candidates, the traditional beneficiaries of divine favour—those who, for the prophets and psalmists, constituted, even in the age of the Law, the

true people of Jahve, the Messianic Israel. But also, and above all, they proclaim the heroes of the justice of the Kingdom, the heirs, pre-eminently, of the Kingdom in heaven.

Eschatological Morality.—There is an opinion, widely held in certain critical circles, that the ideal of the justice of the Kingdom witnesses to an expectation on the part of Jesus of the imminence of the parousia. It is held to be inconceivable except in the supposition that the end of the world and of the present order of things was close at hand. Its morality implied breaking with the normal conditions of life, and was therefore essentially an interim morality; and in proof is alleged the uncompromising and even paradoxical form that Jesus most frequently gives to the rules of conduct which He prescribes.*

Christian judgment, moulded and refined by the Catholic Church, protests against this interpretation. It discerns, better than do the critics, the purpose and true mind of Jesus.

1. It is aware that it has to deal with an *ideal* rule of *supernatural* life. An ideal rule, and not a collection of formulas, immediately practicable and applicable without further analysis to every concrete case. And a rule of a life that is supernatural, that is to say, ordered to transcendent ends, compared with which all goods of the terrestrial order, real as they may be, have no more than a relative value.

2. It observes, further, in this justice of the Kingdom, that it embraces in its unity, as it were, two planes, one above the other, that of the precepts and that of the counsels. This surely stands out plainly in the story of the rich young man, in Matt. xix, 16, *seq.*: "And behold one came and said to Him: Good Master, what shall I

* A. Loisy, *Les évangiles synoptiques*, i, p. 234, *seq.*

do that I may have life everlasting? Who said to him: . . . But if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He said to Him: Which? And Jesus said: *Thou shalt do no murder. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness. Honour thy father and thy mother.* And: *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.* The young man said to him: All these have I kept from my youth. What is yet wanting to me? Jesus saith to him: If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast and give to the poor and thou shalt have treasure in heaven. And come follow Me." cf. Mark x, 17, *seq.;* Luke xviii, 18, *seq.*

"Come and follow Me"; thus did the Twelve, in response to the special call they had received from Jesus. "Then Peter . . . said to Him: Behold, we have left all things and have followed Thee" (Matt. xix, 27). So we are led to think that the rules of conduct which in the Synoptics we find proposed to the Twelve in particular, presuppose this special vocation, and are not applicable to all, at any rate, in the same way.

Nevertheless, there are not really two justices of the Kingdom; one strictly defined, beyond which the great mass of people are not expected to pass; the other with perfection as its goal, which concerns only the chosen few, and which need never be observed. There is but one justice of the Kingdom, proposed to all in its fullness; but to some as proposing a *common rule*, but to others by way of a *special* vocation. And it would seem that for the *latter* the offer is a matter of consequence.

So we read: "And when the young man had heard this word he went away sad; for he had great possessions. Then Jesus said to His disciples: Amen, I say to you that a rich man shall hardly enter into the Kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xix, 22, *seq.*).

The similar sayings reported in Luke ix, 60, *seq.*, should also be read. Practically, and up to a certain point, it is a matter of entering or of not entering into the Kingdom.

CHAPTER IV

THE FOUNDER OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

SUMMARY: I.—*Jesus as the Messias.* II.—*Jesus as the Son of Man.*

IN the order to keep secret His Messiahship, W. Wrede sees a dissembled confession that Jesus did not Himself profess to be the Messias (Mark viii, 30; Matt. xvi, 20; Luke xi, 21). M. Goguel, who is less extreme, admits that if Jesus did not feel Himself to be the Messias in the sense of contemporary Judaism, He was, nevertheless, conscious of being something more than a prophet or a herald of the Messias, as was John the Baptist.

Then, what? He whom God had chosen to play the part of the Messias, the Son of man, when the eschatological Kingdom should come before long. This double hypothesis is clearly irreconcilable with the witness of the Synoptics.

I.—JESUS AS THE MESSIAS

As a matter of fact, contemporary Judaism, whether rabbinical or popular, outside those circles in which apocalyptic speculations flourished, had hardly any other titles with which to designate Him Who was to establish the Kingdom of God than those of Messias and Son of David. They spoke of the Messianic King. But while the good common-folk thought of Him as a glorious King Who would set up again the overthrown throne of David, and would ensure for ever the inde-

pendence of Israel and its domination over the nations, the Rabbis preferably conceived of Him as a pious King, a religious Teacher and Reformer, who would restore the perfect observance of the Law in Israel itself, and would extend it to the Gentiles, thus ensuring the prosperity and glory of the people of God.

THE GOSPEL OF THE INFANCY.—Of Him whom Mary was about to conceive the angel Gabriel declared "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of David His father; and He shall reign in the house of Jacob for ever. and of His Kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i, 32, 33.) It would be impossible to designate the Messias more clearly without actually giving Him that name. The title of Son of the Most High, which, according to the angel's word, is to be given to Him, refers to Psalm ii, 7, of which the Messianic import is not in doubt. The name of Jesus, bestowed on Him by God, which means Saviour, befits as none other Him Whose office is precisely that of saving Israel by freeing and exalting it. That is what the ordinary Jew would have understood.

Elizabeth, in her salutation of the mother of her Lord (Luke i, 43), indirectly attributes to the Child that mother bears the royal title of Lord, which better than any other befits the Messianic King.

The angel who initiates Joseph into the mystery of Mary's pregnancy, quotes to him the prophecy of Isaias vii, 13, of the virgin who shall bring forth Emmanuel, a prophecy of which the Messianic significance was generally recognised (Matt. i, 22). He renews the command to call the child Jesus, "for He shall save His people from their sins"—a Messianic formula which contemporary Judaism understood and appreciated (Matt. i, 21).

"Fear not," said the angel of God to the shepherds at Bethlehem, "for behold, I bring you good tidings of

great joy that shall be to all the people: For this day is born to you a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord, in the city of David" (Luke ii, 10, *seq.*). The title of Saviour, given to the Child, is met with only in this place in the Synoptic Gospels. In John iv, 42, the Samaritans style Him Saviour of the world. St. Peter (Acts v, 31) and St. Paul (Acts xiii, 23), each speaking to the Jews, give Him this title of Saviour, in phrases of an archaic turn. If contemporary Judaism, which knew of it as an attribute of Jahve, did not use it as a current title of the Messias, there can be no doubt that it attributed to Him the function which this word expressed. We have met with this idea above, in Matthew as well as in Luke. There is, therefore, no reason to suspect in this passage in Luke a late Hellenistic influence.

Further, we meet here for the first time with the term Messias in the somewhat rare formula of "Christ the Lord," the common expression being "the Lord's Christ." Before this, "Christ the Lord" is met with only in the Psalms of Solomon, xvii, 36, and xviii, title. This formula brings into relief the royal dignity of the Messias, which is some indication of its primitiveness.

Simeon hails in the Son of Mary "the Lord's Christ." He declares His mission in terms which recall Isaias, seemingly with an allusion at the end to the prophecies of the suffering servant (Luke ii, 26, *seq.*). The notion of the Messiahship of Jesus, and of a Messiaship which concerns the Gentiles themselves, is predominant in the story of the adoration of the magi, in Matt. ii, 1, *seq.*

These Messianic texts belong to the substance of the Gospel of the Infancy. They are, moreover, so well in accordance with tradition and so reserved, so little influenced by later occurrences, that it is impossible to see in them a projection of post-resurrection faith upon the infancy of Jesus. On the other hand, it is quite conceivable that the facts and utterances recounted

in the earlier chapters of Matthew and Luke had little effect upon public opinion, and that the Gospel account of the public ministry should contain no allusion to them. It was not till later, after the Ascension, that the disciples themselves had any detailed knowledge of them; and if it was their faith which urged them to seek information about what had happened so long ago, that only enables us to affirm more certainly that it did not lead them to enrich the Messianic character of the accounts of the Infancy with details suggested by the life, death and glorification of the Lord.

THE PREPARATION FOR THE MESSIAS.—We have seen above that John the Baptist had recognised, and had declared to his disciples, the Messianic character of Jesus. Of the titles which he gives them—"This is the Son of God," and "Behold the Lamb of God, Who taketh away the sin of the world"—the first only was known to the Jews as a name of the Messias, though it was not commonly used. The second is new, and it is difficult to determine its exact meaning (John i, 29, *seq.*). A little further on—John iii, 28—the Baptist implicitly gives to Jesus the name of Christ itself.

The two disciples of John the Baptist who follow Jesus bring back from their conversation with Him a vivid impression that He is really the Messias (John i, 41, *seq.*). Such, too, is the opinion of Philip, who tells Nathanael, in more equivocal terms: "We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus the Son of Joseph of Nazareth" (John i, 45.) Soon after this is echoed by Nathanael: "Rabbi: Thou art the Son of God. Thou art the King of Israel" (John i, 49). And Jesus implicitly acquiesces.

But this impression made on the first disciples is a very superficial one.

THE MESSIANIC SECRET.—A considerable time passes, with no new light on the subject. At Jerusalem and in Galilee, through His preaching and by His deeds, Jesus has come into touch with the people of Israel and with its rulers. Whether He attracts or irritates, to all He seems to be a personage out of the common. Already aroused by the preaching of John the Baptist, the hope of the Messias begins to throb in the hearts of men, especially of the common folk. Jesus, however, wholly taken up, as He was, with the Kingdom, observes a strict reserve with regard to Himself. Never does he claim, in the hearing of the Jewish public, one of the common names of the Messias. He silences the devils, lest their importunate homage should impress the multitude. His solicitude in respect of this is clearly brought out in Luke iv, 41: "And rebuking them, He suffered them not to speak; for they knew that He was Christ." He escapes from the attentions of the multitude, when they wish to make Him King of Israel (John vi, 14, *seq.*). None the less, the simple folk keep on questioning from time to time: "Is not this the Son of David?" (Matt. xii, 23.) Later the rulers themselves will find themselves obliged to consider this possibility.

However, neither the people nor their leaders recognised in the person of Jesus the realisation of their respective ideals of the Messias. Even among the followers of John the Baptist there is some impatience: "Art Thou He that art to come, or look we for another?" (Matt. xi, 2, *seq.;* Luke vii, 19, *seq.*). And decisive as Jesus' reply may seem to us, it must have misled his interrogators. Public opinion went astray into guesses which betray its disappointment. "It is John the Baptist risen again; it is one of the ancient prophets come again; it is Elias, Jeremias, a prophet, at any rate" (Matt. xv, 14). Even Jesus' disciples seem to have lost their earlier certainty. There is more of admiring wonder than of

any clear notion in Peter's exclamation after the walking on the water and the sudden ceasing of the wind: "Indeed, Thou art the Son of God" (Matt. xiv, 33).

Does this behaviour of Jesus mean, then, that He feels that He is not the Messias, or at least not yet? Does it not rather evince His knowledge that He is neither the Messias of popular expectations, nor that of the Doctors? What follows in the Synoptic account leaves no doubt as to the answer to this alternative, nor as to the meaning of the reserve and circumspection which Jesus manifests. We have here no piece of contrivance by the evangelists, but a quite understandable piece of tactics on the part of Jesus, Who knows that His real mission is very different from that attributed to the Messias by those around Him, and even among His disciples themselves.

To the Samaritan woman who tries to evade Him by saying: "I know that the Messias cometh (who is called Christ); therefore, when He is come, He will tell us all things," Jesus replies: "I am He, Who am speaking with thee" (John iv, 25). She is a foreigner, so He need not be so careful. Without the least remonstrance from Him, the Canaanite woman—again a foreigner—calls Him the Son of David, which was the most popular of all the Messianic titles (Matt. xv, 22). In reply to the direct and solemn question of his Master, Peter confesses that Jesus is the Christ, and receives in impressive terms the congratulations of Jesus, Who at the same time lays upon His disciples the same rule of circumspection and silence which He Himself observes. Then, suddenly and for the first time, He announces to them His coming passion (Mark viii, 27, *seq.*, and parallel passages).

However, little by little, Jesus relaxes His strictness. "Have mercy on us, O Son of David," had been some time before the cry of the two blind men mentioned in Matt. iv, 27, *seq.*, and Jesus had healed them. The

blind men of Jericho uttered the same prayer, in the presence of a considerable crowd of people, and Jesus answered it (Matt. xx, 29, and parallel passages). The acclamations which burst forth at the triumphal entry into Jerusalem (foreseen by Jesus Himself) were expressly Messianic. When the Pharisees protested, Jesus replies to them: "I say to you that if these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out" (Luke xix, 40). When Jesus propounds to His adversaries the difficulty of the Christ being at once the Son of David and His Lord (Ps. cix, 1), He does not question the Messianic implication of the appellation "Son of David," nor does He suggest that He makes no claim to it. On the contrary; and His object is to use this text to draw attention discreetly to the mystery of His personality, which even His disciples hardly suspect (Matt. xxii, 42, *seq.*, and parallel passages). In His great eschatological discourse Jesus speaks as the Messias, and foretells His parousia: "For many will come in My name saying, I am Christ" (Matt. xxiv, 5, and parallel passages).

The Passion.—Here the Messiahship of Jesus comes decidedly to the front and fills the whole field. Notice how the idea of it obsesses the enemies of the Master. The servants of the high priest taunt him—"Prophesy unto us, O Christ. Who is he that struck Thee?" (Matt. xxvi, 68). The high priest himself asks Him: "Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed God?" And Jesus answers: "I am."

The Sanhedrin complained to Pilate: "We have found this Man . . . saying that He is Christ the King." And the Procurator asked Him: "Art Thou the King of the Jews?" Luke, xxiii, 2, *seq.*). Jesus' reply is given in full in John xviii, 33, *seq.:* "Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or have others told it thee of Me?" Pilate answered: "Am I a Jew? Thy own nation and the chief priests

have delivered Thee up to me. What hast Thou done?" Jesus answered: "My Kingdom is not of this world [not an earthly Kingdom]. If My Kingdom were of this world my servants would certainly strive that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My Kingdom not from hence." The relevance of this reply is a guarantee of its authenticity. "Pilate therefore said to Him: Art Thou a king then? Jesus answered: Thou sayest that I am a King." He claims to be the Messianic King, and from that Pilate is to fashion the title on the Cross—"Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews."

Meanwhile he taunts the Sanhedrin about it: "What will you then that I do to the King of the Jews?" (Mark xv, 12). "Behold your King. . . . Shall I crucify your King?" (John xix, 14, 15). The soldiers, who have picked up this title, find a place for it in their mockery (Mark xv, 18); and as a final insult the Sanhedrin throw it in the face of Jesus as he hangs on the Cross, crowned with thorns (Mark xv, 32).

We are told of the incoherence of the Synoptic account —that it is falsified by the projection of post-resurrection belief upon a story in which there was no Messianic factor at all. What alone is artificial is the anti-Messianic hypothesis, whether in the mitigated form which M. Goguel has given to it, or in the extreme form in which Wrede first presented it. Jesus' conduct, as reported by the Synoptics, and especially by Mark, is quite intelligible. Jesus was the Messias, and knew that He was, and acknowledged it at the proper time. But He was not the Messias of popular dreams, nor that of rabbinical speculation.

II.—Jesus as the Son of Man

Better than the title of Messias, that of Son of man, of which He was so fond, will reveal to us the notion which Jesus Himself had of His office and of His mission with regard to the Kingdom of God.

In the Hebrew, *Son of man* means *man* (cf. Psalm viii, 5). Similarly, in Aramaic, in which *Son of man* may also be equivalent to the pronoun *I*. But in Daniel we meet with "one like the Son of man" (vii, 13), that is to say, "like a human being"; and he, in contradistinction to the four beasts who symbolize earthly royalties, stands for the Kingdom of God. Indeed, we are given the impression that the Son of man is not merely a symbol of the Messianic Kingdom, but represents a real person.

Again, we meet with this expression, Son of man, bearing just this signification in chapters xxxvii-lxxi of the Book of Enoch, which is known as the Book of Parables, in which we find Enoch himself set up as the heavenly Messias. The peculiar, or even unique, function of this Messias is that of judge. The question arises whether this Book of Parables is anterior to the deliveries of the Gospels, to which it bears undeniable resemblances, or does it derive from them? There are various solutions, but no certain answer can be given. It is clear, in any case, that the use made of this formula by Jesus is disconcerting to His hearers, to whom its Messianic significance does, to say the least, seem to have been familiar. "Who is this Son of man?" they ask, with some appearance of annoyance (John xii, 34).

Son of Man in the sense of *I*.—Except in John v, 27, where "the Son of man" seems to stand for *a human being*, in the Gospels "Son of man" never signifies *man*

in general. On the contrary, it seems clearly, and very often, to be nothing else than an Aramaic idiom for *I, myself*. This seems to be the case in Luke vi, 22, where "the Son of man" has as its equivalent in Matt. v, 2, "I." In John vi Jesus uses both "I" and "the Son of man" in turn. No doubt the formula is used in this sense in Matt. viii, 20, and Luke ix, 58; in Matt. xi, 19, and Luke vii, 34; in Matt. xii, 32, and Luke xii, 10; in Matt. xvi, 13; in Mark viii, 27, and Luke ix, 18.

However, on the lips of Jesus this current and fashionable expression, as Père Lagrange remarks, takes on a suggestion of mysteriousness; as, for instance, in Matt. xvi, 13, and the parallel passages: "Whom do men say that the Son of man is?" In the comparison between the Son of man and John the Baptist—Matt. xi, 18, 19; Luke vii, 33, 34—is given the impression of a reserved meaning which cannot be exactly expressed. The formula even takes on a kind of superhuman grandeur when we hear of "blasphemy" against the Son of man (Matt. xii, 31, *seq.*, and the parallel passages).

Son of Man as an Appellation.—Because of the suggestion of emphasis and of mystery which we have just noticed in the evangelical use of the expression *Son of man*, we experience no surprise when we find it became a true appellation. It is now clearly promoted to the rank of a personal designation; as in Luke xix, 10: "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost"; in Luke v, 24: "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Again, in Luke vi, 5: "The Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath"; and in Matt. xiii, 37: "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man." In Luke xi, 30, the Son of man is a sign for His own generation, as Jonas was for his. The translation "I" would seem decidedly inadequate. "Son of man," while it designates Jesus, at the same time describes

Him, that is to say, it manifests the powers with which He considers Himself to be invested, and the mission which He claims for Himself.

Son of Man as a Messianic Title.—That *Son of man* is really equivalent to *Messias* is taken for granted in Mark xiv, 61, *seq.*: "Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed God?" "I am. And you shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of the power of God and coming with the clouds of heaven." cf. Matt. xxvi, 63, *seq.;* Luke xxii, 67, *seq.*

(a) *With reference to Daniel vii.*—Such is the case in the texts in which the Son of man appears in the character of judge (Matt. xiii, 36, *seq.;* Mark viii, 38, and the parallel passages; Luke xviii, 8). Or in an eschatological context, as in Matt. xxiv, 27; Luke xvii, 24; Matt. xxiv, 30; Mark xiii, 26, *seq.;* Luke xxi, 27, *seq.;* Matt. xxiv, 37, *seq.;* Luke xvii, 26, *seq.* And again, in Matt. xix, 28: "You who have followed Me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His majesty, you also shall sit on twelve seats . . ."

But the reference to Daniel is also found in texts which are not really eschatological. So it is in Mark xiv, 61, and the parallels, which we adduced but just now in proof of the positive equivalence of the formulas *Son of man* and *Messias*. We must now return to them. The text of Mark is taken here as primitive in relation to Matthew and Luke. "Art Thou the Christ," asks the high priest, "the Son of the Blessed God?" And Jesus replies, "I am." And He adds: "And you shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of the power of God and coming with the clouds of heaven." "You shall see yourselves, you members of the Sanhedrin who make yourselves my judges." But what exactly will they see? The Son of man seated and coming. This simultaneousness, as seen by the Sanhedrin, of a state and of an action

which would naturally be considered as successive, holds the mind in suspense, and leads it to ask whether it has not before it a stereotyped formula intended merely to signify the approaching exaltation of Jesus as the heavenly Messias. "You shall see." But when and how? Here we turn to the version of Matt. xxvi, 64: "*Henceforth* you shall see . . . ."* We have to do, then, with a permanent vision. That means that it is not a question of a true vision. "You shall see," i.e. "you shall know." This is so much the case that Luke (xxii, 69) can, without being false to the real meaning of Jesus, drop these stylistic formulas and write simply: "But henceforth† the Son of man shall be sitting on the right hand of God." So we are really dealing with a Messianic title connected with Daniel vii, but without any reference to the parousia.

We have already said something on this difficult problem of the parousia, and (when dealing with Mark viii, 38-ix, 1, and the parallel passages) pointed out that there is reason to distinguish between historical parousias and an eschatological parousia. Matt. x, 23, must certainly be taken to refer to an historical parousia, that is to say, to a special intervention, in the course of historical events, on the part of Jesus exalted as Son of man: "And when they shall persecute you in this city flee into another. Amen, I say to you, you shall not finish all the cities of Israel till the Son of man come."

In the parable of the servants who are to watch (Matt. xxiv, 44, and parallel passages) we are led to think that the parousia of the Son of man—as it is brought before us in this context—takes place at the death of each individual.‡

* Eng. version: *Hereafter* (Trans.).

† Eng. version: *Hereafter* (Trans.).

‡ M. J. Lagrange, *L'Avènement du Fils de l'homme*, in the *Revue Biblique*. 1906.

(b) *With reference to the Suffering Servant.*—Here we have a quite different use of "Son of man" as a Messianic title. It suggests that somewhat disparaging shade of meaning which is connected in the Hebrew Bible with this and corresponding terms: Son of woman, man, human being, flesh, etc. All these imply weakness, lowliness, and especially in comparison with God. But it has reference, much more distinctly, to the prophecies of the Suffering Servant (Isaias xlii, 1-14; xlix, 1-6; l, 4-9; lii, 13-liii, 12). It does not evoke a picture of glory and power, but of abasement and humiliation.

"Son of man" is indeed the formula which Jesus uses to designate Himself whenever He announces His Passion; and this He does in definite terms, on three different occasions, as we know. Firstly, after the confession of Peter, as if He were in haste to make clear what kind of Messias He is: "And He began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the ancients and by the high priests and scribes; and be killed and after three days rise again" (Mark viii, 31, *seq.*; Matt. xvi, 21, *seq.*; Luke ix, 22, *seq.*). A second time, still in Galilee, after the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii, 21, 22): "The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men. And they shall kill Him: and the third day He shall rise again." cf. Mark ix, 30, and Luke ix, 44. Finally, near Jericho, when He is going up to Jerusalem: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and all things shall be accomplished which were written by the prophets concerning the Son of man. For He shall be delivered to the Gentiles and shall be mocked and scourged and spit upon. And after they have scourged Him, they will put Him to death. And the third day He shall rise again" (Luke xviii, 31, *seq.;* Matt. xx, 18, *seq.;* Mark x, 33.

Other, secondary, announcements re-echo these solemn declarations. For example, in Luke xvii, 24,

seq.: "For as the lightning that lighteneth from under heaven shineth unto the parts that are under heaven, so shall the Son of man be in His day [at the parousia]. But first He must suffer many things and be rejected by this generation." So, too, in Mark ix, 11; Matt. xii, 39, *seq.;* xvi, 4, *seq.;* Luke xi, 29, *seq.*

Several times, too, we are told that this destiny of the Messias was foretold by the prophets; cf. Luke xxiv, 46. This is implicitly to identify the Son of man no more with the personage of Daniel vii, but with the mysterious Suffering Servant of Isaias, and in the presence of that Jewish exegesis stood as if inderdicted.

The Idea of Redemption.—The destiny of the Son of man was decreed by the Father and accepted by the Son: "Therefore," we read in John x, 17, *seq.*, "doth the Father love Me: because I lay down My life that I may take it again. No man taketh it away from Me: but I lay it down of Myself. And I have power to lay it down: and I have power to take it up again. This commandment have I received of My Father." In Mark x, 45, we are given a saying of Jesus which interprets this mystery: "For the Son of man also is not come to be ministered unto: but to minister and to give His life a redemption for many." The insinuation is made that this is a Pauline interpretation of the scandal of the Cross, audaciously put into the mouth of Jesus. This implies an entire failure to understand this part of the synoptic narrative, dominated as it is by Isaias' Messianic idea of the Suffering Servant. The truth is that this saying of Jesus is just what we should expect, and it is without the least surprise that we find it confirmed in other places. Matt. xx, 28, re-echoes Mark x, 45. John iii, 14, 15, report another, and very similar, saying: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in Him may not

perish, but may have life everlasting." John xii, 31, *seq.*, set before us the lifting up of Jesus on the Cross as a decisive victory over Satan, and as the starting-point of that universal attraction which henceforth Jesus is to exercise over men. Caiphas, in his prophetic declaration, implies that the death of Jesus is to secure the salvation of the nation. Nay more, as John explains—xi, 52: "To gather together in one the children of God that were dispersed."

The synoptic narratives of the institution of the Eucharist bring this doctrine of the redeeming death into marked relief. Mark writes thus in xiv, 24: "And He said to them: This is My blood [the blood] of the new testament, which shall be shed for many." And Matt. xxvi, 28: "Drink ye all of this, for this is My blood [the blood] of the new testament which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins."

Now all this takes us back to the reserved statements of the Gospel of the Infancy—Matt. i, 21; Luke i, 77; Luke ii, 11—which are thus confirmed and made clearer. We may also recall the saying of John the Baptist, which though obscure enough as to its meaning, bears in its tone a striking resemblance to Isaias: "Behold the Lamb of God, Who taketh away the sin of the world" (John i, 29).

In the earliest chapters of the Acts, on the morrow of the Ascension itself, the same interpretation of the death of Jesus is presented. In that death is seen the essential action of His mission, and the foundation of the part He is to play later of the Messias of glory, of Lord, of effectual Saviour. Thus Peter expounds the case: "The God of our fathers hath raised up Jesus, Whom you put to death, hanging Him upon a tree. Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be Prince and Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins (Acts v, 30). Yet again, Peter, when speaking of

Jesus as the Messias, gives Him the title of Servant, which shows that he interprets His passion and death in the light of the prophecies of Isaias (Acts iii, 13).*

This complexity of the portrait of Jesus the Messias recalls that of the presentation of the Kingdom and Realm of God, of which He is the Founder. And this correspondence is a guarantee of the trustworthiness of the evangelical witness.

With this we end this outline of what we may call the most prominent message of the revelation brought to the world by Jesus Christ.

* The English Bible here has "his Son" (Trans.).

PART II

THE NEW ECONOMY OF SALVATION

CHAPTER I

FROM THE STATE OF SIN TO THE STATE OF JUSTICE

SUMMARY: I.—*St. Paul and the Revelation of Jesus Christ.* II.—*The dominion of sin.* III.—*The justice of the Law.* IV.—*The justice of Faith.*

I.—SAINT PAUL AND THE REVELATION OF JESUS CHRIST

SAINT PAUL tells us that he received his Gospel of Jesus Christ by revelation, and that not by that exterior and public revelation with which the Twelve had been directly commissioned, of which they were the official trustees, and which they might have imparted to him, but by a personal and direct revelation—a privilege accorded to him, together with that of the apostolate, by the glorified Lord (Gal. i, 1, *seq.*).

But what exactly does he mean by his Gospel? In Gal. ii, 7, he writes: "They [the notables in Jerusalem] had seen that to me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision." The particular Gospel which he holds from Christ Himself must be, then, the Gospel of the Gentiles. That is to say, that his special mission was to evangelize the Gentiles by giving them a divinely guaranteed

certainty that the economy of salvation instituted by Jesus was open to them without any other condition than that of faith, and all that that view implies.

This does not imply that St. Paul is not, at bottom, a qualified interpreter of the historic and public revelation, of which he brings forward what we have called the secondary stage; and he carries on the work of the Synoptics, by whom this revelation has been presented to us in its deliveries of primary rank.

Further, we find St. Paul in close intellectual relation with the primitive Community and its leaders, the trustees of the historic revelation. It is from the Community, from Stephen, before his conversion, from Ananias, at the time of his baptism, a little later from Barnabas, from Cephas, and doubtless from others also, that he receives what knowledge he has of the life and teaching of Jesus; and the more closely one looks into his Epistles, the more one is convinced that he knows them well. From this source he has certainly what he nevertheless calls his Gospel, in I Cor. xv, i, *seq.*, though in a sense other than that of Gal. i, 1, *seq.*, and ii, 11, *seq.* Let us recall this important summary of the faith common both to the primitive Church and to St. Paul. "Now I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received and wherein you stand. By which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain. For I have delivered unto you, first of all, which I also received: how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures: And that He was seen of Cephas; and after that by the eleven. Then was He seen by more than five hundred brethren at once: of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep. After that He was seen by James: then by all the apostles. . . ."

The data common to the primitive Church and to

St. Paul are not restricted to the two facts of Christ's redeeming death and glorious resurrection, essential though they are. But to draw out the complete list would require more space than we have at our disposal. We must confine ourselves to a few points of major importance. The Christ both of Palestinian and Pauline faith is the Lord of Glory who has entered through the Resurrection into the full exercise of His power and dominion; cf. Acts ii, 36, Rom. i, 3, *seq.* Faith in Him is the essential condition for the partaking of salvation; cf. Acts x, 43, and xv, 9, and throughout Paul's letters.

The gift of the Holy Spirit is the pledge, and, indeed, the present reality of this salvation; cf. Acts ii, 38, and the Epistles *passim.* The Gentiles have access to this salvation, as well as the Jews, and independently of circumcision and of the Law; cf. Acts xv and Gal. ii, etc. We may say that we find here substantially the gospel which St. Paul says he received from Christ.

This thoroughgoing agreement between St. Paul and the primitive Community, this connection from the very beginning and living continuity of their religious thought, are now recognised by a large number of critics, who no longer set up Pauline doctrine, as a heterogeneous system, against Palestinian faith and piety.

If, as it penetrated into Hellenistic circles, the religion of Jerusalem took on some new exterior forms, if it rid itself more completely of a remnant of Jewish psychology, if it enhanced certain ideas and spiritual factors, neither itself, nor the historic Revelation of Jesus Christ which it contained and carried with it, suffered any heterogeneous addition or underwent any real transformation.

All that St. Paul has done is to give us a more profound presentation, a fuller and more systematic account, of the doctrine and work of Jesus Christ than any of his predecessors and contemporaries. For him, as also

for the primitive Community, the work of Christ, in the light of his teaching, represents primarily a new economy of salvation. But the Soteriology demands a Christology to explain it. We find St. Paul's Soteriology mainly in the great doctrinal Epistles of the beginning of his apostolate; his Christology more especially in the Epistles of his captivity.

II.—The Dominion of Sin

The Soteriology, or doctrine of salvation, in St. Paul's teaching presupposes expressly the universal dominion of sin. It is, at least so far as this statement goes, its distinctive characteristic. "Both Jews and Greeks," he writes in Rom. iii, 9, "are all under sin"; and cf. Rom. iii, 23.

This dominion of sin St. Paul sees firmly established in the very heart of man (Rom. viii, 7-25). There is a duality in man—"the inward man" and "the flesh"—and each of these men has its own particular "law." That of the inward man is "the law of the mind," which makes him delight in the law of God. That of the flesh is a double law, namely, the "law of sin" and the "law of concupiscence," which are "in his members," and which war against the law of the mind. Sometimes, instead of the law of sin, he says, "the law of sin and death," or simply "sin"; and instead of the law of concupiscence he will say "concupiscence," "the concupiscences," "the passions of sins." From this division and conflict of laws which man, himself divided, bears within himself arise through the intervention of the divine Law—the Commandment—inward conflicts, in which it seems that the law of the mind and the law of God regularly get the worst of it. Not that man does not will the good according to the higher part of his nature, but sin, to which he is sold into slavery, prevents by reason of the

concupiscence which it excites the realisation of this willing of the good; and that not only to his hurt, but to his condemnation, for he remains free and responsible for himself.

What, then, is this duality? What in particular is the flesh? And since it is marked by servitude to the double law of sin and concupiscence, what may be the origin of this sin and this concupiscence which dwell in the members? A superficial reading of Rom. vii, 7-10 might lead us to think that it is the intervention of the commandment which leads to their manifestation in man. But a closer inspection shows us that what is meant is that through the stimulation of this commandment, which is itself good and holy, a new and more intense activity is awakened, which testifies to the malice of sin. Sin and concupiscence existed already in man before that intervention of the commandment which St. Paul has in view.

To find the account of their origin we must turn to the famous passage in Rom. v, 12, 19. Neither the Old Testament—in spite of Job xiv, 4, of Psalms l, 7, of Wisdom ii, 23, and of Ecclesiasticus xx, 33—nor contemporary Jewish theology, nor the Gospels, contain anything so clear and explicit on what we call original sin. Père Prat describes as follows the state of religious thought on this subject before St. Paul: "Also, the dogma of the original Fall could not be a source of difficulty to the contemporaries of St. Paul, since they admitted without hesitation, on the authority of the Scriptures, that Adam's disobedience has meant for us death, inclination towards evil, and the miserable state of human nature as it is."* That is as much as we can say.

But St. Paul is the first to add to these received ideas the *explicit* notion of guilt, of inherited *sin.* Evidently he has in mind the account of Adam's fall (Gen. iii),

* F. Prat, *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, II. 6th edition, 1923. p. 67.

and it is the meaning of that fall for the succeeding generations of men that he attempts to explain when he writes: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into this world and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men, who have all sinned. . . ." (Rom. v, 12). The construction of the sentence and the train of thought require as a logical complement: (who have all sinned) *in Adam.** This is beyond doubt when we read further on: "Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation," which implies a solidarity in the offence (Rom. v, 18). And again: "By the disobedience of one man all were constituted sinners"† (Rom. v, 19). By Adam's act, not only into the world—that is, of humanity—but into each individual man has sin entered, and with it concupiscence, and this double tyranny constitutes "the flesh."

Many of the old expositors have tried to find in Ephes. ii, 3, a doctrine of original sin expressed in still more technical terms: "In which also we all [disobedient men] conversed in time past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the will of the flesh and of our thoughts, and were [we Jews] by nature children of wrath, even as the rest." "By nature"—of which the converse is "by grace"—means "of ourselves," and not "by birth." Moreover, St. Paul's train of thought here corresponds to that of Rom. i, 18-iii, and not at all to that of Rom. v, 12-19, nor even to that of Rom. vii, 7, *seq.* At most one may say that this text (Eph. ii, 3) calls to mind the state of things described in Rom. vii, 7, and may subscribe to this statement of Père Prat: "If, then, original sin is not named here, it is indicated with sufficient clearness as the common source of the evil inclinations with which our nature is now infected."‡

* The English (Catholic) Version here reads: "in whom all have sinned" (Trans.).

† English: "many were made sinners" (Trans.).

‡ Op. cit. p. 70; and cf. J. M. Voste, *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Ephesios.* Paris, 1921. p. 253, *seq.*

The devil, whom we are shown in the account of the Fall presiding over the entrance of sin into the world, continues to play an active part in the development of his dominion, and even in this interior conflict in which in every man the tyrannical power of sin asserts itself. When we observe (in Rom. vii, 7, *seq.*) how St. Paul seems to personify sin, we are tempted to wonder whether this sin may not be the devil. "It is not exactly the devil," writes Père Lagrange, "but sin personified as a power hostile to man."* Père Prat is still more guarded: "All that can and should be admitted is that the presence of a personal being at the back of the principle of evil makes the consistent personification of sin much easier."† Yes, so long as we hold that sin denotes primarily something that is in man, in the flesh, as is concupiscence, that is to say what original sin is, as we know from other sources.

As regards the personal activity of the devil, St. Paul speaks of it openly, in Ephes. ii, 1: "And you, when you were dead in your offences and sins, wherein in time past you walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the children of unbelief. . . ." There is an allusion to this spirit in I Cor. xii, 2: "You know that when you were heathens you went to dumb idols, according as you were led." And again, more explicitly in II Cor. iv, 3, 4: "And if our Gospel be also hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of unbelievers." The dominion of sin is, then, the dominion of the devil, to St. Paul, as to Jesus; cf. John xii, 31, xiv, 30, xvi, 11; Luke x, 18, etc. Satan, or Belial, or the devil, appears in St. Paul's writings, as in the Gospels, as the leader of a vast number of spirits who are the agents and

* M. J. Lagrange, *Epître aux Romains.* Paris, 1916. p. 169.

† F. Prat, op. cit., p. 77, *seq.*

instruments of his dominion. "Put you on," writes the Apostle, "the armour of God, that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood: but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirits of wickedness in the high places" (Ephes. vi, 11, 12).

To the dominion of sin, which is also that of the wrath of God (Rom. i, 18; ii, 5), St. Paul opposes that of justice, and to the state of sin the state of justice. The passing from one to the other is termed justification. Supposing its possibility, how is this justification effected? By the Law, or by Faith?

III.—The Justice of the Law

What it is.—St. Paul opposes it insistently to the justice of faith. Thus, he writes in Philip. iii, 9: "(That I) may be found in him [Christ], not having my justice, which is of the law, but that which is of the faith of Christ Jesus, which is of God: justice in faith." The chief characteristic of the justice of the Law is that it is man's own justice; by which is meant that it is the fruit of his own works, which are, in this case, the works of the Law.

But if the Law justifies by its works, that can only be so in the hypothesis of a true and entire fulfilment of it. Considering the insistence with which St. Paul keeps returning to this assertion, we should be inclined to say that his adversaries, the Jews, were not in agreement with him on this matter. As a matter of fact, they seem to have wished to rest their case, in this matter of justification, on the privileges which they had received from God. These privileges St. Paul acknowledges and extols (Rom. ii, 17, *seq.*; ix, 4, *seq.*). But he asserts that they have no relevance here, and that when it comes to judging men, there is no respect of persons with God:

"For not the hearers of the law are just before God; but the doers of the law shall be justified" (Rom. ii, 13). Still, to be observed it must have been known, and so, by a side-wind at least, the privilege of the Jews comes in again. Not so; and the Apostle gives us a hint that it may be possible for the Gentiles to observe, *natura duce*, the commandments of the Law, written in their hearts (Rom. ii, 14, *seq.*)—a valuable corrective though a somewhat vague one to the gloomy picture drawn in Rom. i, 18-32, and even to the analysis of the inward conflict of Rom. vii, 7, *seq.*

The Jews are supposed to found their claim very specially on circumcision.* "Circumcision," replies the Apostle, "profiteth indeed, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a transgressor of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision" (Rom. ii, 25). For him circumcision implies precisely an undertaking to observe the whole Law (Gal. v, 3).

Being a man's own justice, the justice of works and of works of the Law, the justice of the Law has, then, for its second mark the obligation of a real and entire observance of this Law; cf. Rom. x, 5; Gal. iii, 12.

God's real design.—Now the Jews, declares St. Paul, do not, in fact, observe the Law. But we notice, not without surprise, that this non-observation of the Law and this failure in following after the justice that is of works (Rom. ix, 30, *seq.*) do not represent merely a fact, but correspond to what must be called equity. We have proof of this, for instance, in Gal. ii, 16: "But knowing that man is not justified by works of the law . . . .

* It was a tendency of rabbinical Judaism to consider circumcision as impressing a character of indelible sanctity. Did it not, indeed, go so far as to imagine that Abraham always waited at the gate of Gehenna, to restore the state of uncircumcision to rare criminals whose outrageous sins made it quite impossible to keep them from punishment?

because by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified." The last expression must surely be read in the light of equity. For St. Paul the Law cannot lead to justice.

How does that come about? From man's powerlessness to observe it? From some words of St. Paul we are led to think so. Let us recall what he writes in Rom. vii, 7, on the reaction of sin and concupiscence against the commandment, and of the failure of man in servitude to their tyranny; cf. Rom. vii, 5; viii, 2; I Cor. xv, 56, etc. The Law, although not by its own action, but through the working of concupiscence, and above all of sin, is far from attracting man to obedience, but rather provokes him to transgression, that is to say, to formal disobedience: "For the law worketh wrath. For where there is no law, neither is there transgression" (Rom. iv, 15). In short, we see that man finds himself in a state which renders this way of justification by the observation of the Law impracticable for him.

Is, then, God's design thus frustrated? On the contrary. God has not really meant that the Law should, itself, procure man's justification. His plan is much less simple. St. Paul says boldly: "Now the law entered in that sin might abound" (Rom. v, 20). And again: "For by the law is the knowledge of sin" (Rom. iii, 20) —the function of the law is nothing else than to make sin fully known. No doubt this result is brought about by man's doing and by man's fault; but God foresees it and reckons with it—this, of course, with a view ultimately to make use of it, to the advantage of a wider and beneficent design. So St. Paul writes, in Gal. iii, 11: "But that in the law no man is justified with God, it is manifest: because *the just man* [and he alone] *liveth by faith.* Now the law is not of faith: but *He that doth those things shall live by them.*"

The doctrine is subtle, and it would seem that St.

Paul experiences some difficulty in finding an entirely satisfactory expression of it. The system of justification by faith finds its typical application in the justification of Abraham (Rom. iv, 1-25). Thenceforth God established it as a unique system exclusive of any other. But this system was established by way of promise made to Abraham and to his posterity, that is to say, to Christ. Gal. iii, 15, *seq.*: "Why, then," asks St. Paul, "was the law? It was set because of transgressions, until the seed should come to whom he made the promise. . . . If there had been a law given which could give life, verily justice should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise, by the faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe. But before the faith came, we were kept under the law shut up, unto that faith that was to be revealed. Wherefore the law was our pedagogue in Christ: that we might be justified by faith" (Gal. iii, 19, *seq.*). So we read in Rom. v, 4: "For the end of the law is Christ: unto justice to everyone that believeth."

This, unfortunately, the Jews did not understand: "For they, not knowing the justice of God and seeking to establish their own, have not submitted themselves to the justice of God" (Rom. x, 3). Once more, contrasting their conduct with that of the Gentiles, St. Paul writes: "What then shall we say? That the Gentiles who followed not after justice have attained to justice, even the justice that is of faith. But Israel, by following after the law of justice, is not come unto the law of justice. Why so? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were of works. For they stumbled at the stumbling-stone. As it is written: Behold, I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone and a rock of scandal. And whosoever believeth in him shall not be confounded" (Rom. ix, 30, *seq.*).

The faithfulness of God, who has chosen Israel, is

not in question. The fault lies altogether with Israel. However, the rejection of that nation through which an entrance is found for the Gentiles is not to be final. In the end God will bring back His people (Rom. ix-xi).

IV.—The Justice of Faith

Just as he defined the justice of the Law by contrasting it with the justice of Faith, so St. Paul defines the justice of Faith by contrasting it with the justice of the Law, adding, however, some more positive features.

The justice of Faith is God's justice. Thus it is the opposite of the justice of the Law, which is a man's own justice. Some texts leave us in doubt as to the precise meaning of this formula—the justice of God—since the genitive may imply either the subject or the cause of the justice of faith. Rom. i, 17, and iii, 21-26, may be taken in either sense. In Rom. x, 3, the term seems to be used in the sense of a justice confessed by God, and this is quite clearly so in II Cor. v, 21, and especially in Philip. iii, 9: "I count all things to be but loss . . . that I . . . may be found in Him, not having my justice, which is of the law, but that which is of the faith of Christ Jesus, which is of God: justice in faith."

This justice, then, which is the work of God, is absolutely independent of the works of the Law: "For we account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law" (Rom. iii, 28). That is its second mark; St. Paul is insistent upon this point. It presupposes no good works of any kind: "For by grace you are saved through faith: and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God" (Ephes. ii, 8). Again: "Not by the works of justice that we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us" (Titus iii, 5). It is not a case of a recompense merited by works performed (cf. Rom. iv, 4, *seq.*), but of a gift of God, of a grace, of mercy. And so we have

this result, in which the Apostle delights: "Where is then thy boasting? It is excluded" (Rom. iii, 27; I Cor. i, 29, *seq.*).

Does, then, this justice of faith consist in faith alone, taking the place of works? That is the Lutheran interpretation, which St. Paul's language contradicts. Sometimes it is justice, sometimes it is justification, that he relates to faith; but he expresses this relation by the use of prepositions which positively exclude the identity of the two terms. For faith, we may refer to Rom. iii, 22; ix, 30; Philip. iii, 9, *seq.;* Heb. xi, 7. The only exception is found in Rom. iv, 11, 13, where we find: "the justice of faith." But the context shows that the genitive expresses origin. For justification, see Rom. iii, 30; v, 1, etc. However, in Rom. iii, 28, we have a construction with the dative, *pistei.* This is the instrumental dative, which signifies: by means of faith, the subject, or principal agent, being God.

Well, then, what is this justice which is not to be identified with faith, and, on the other hand, owes nothing to works? Is it simply an imputation of Christ's justice, as Luther would have it to be? Then it is merely a fiction. To attribute to it a juridical character or value makes no difference. Whether the fiction be juridical or moral, imputed justice is still but a fiction. Now, it is just that to which the evident realism of St. Paul's style and thought cannot be made to lend itself. A systematic study in particular of the verb "to justify" and its derivatives, in the Septuagint and the N.T., leads us in another direction. To put it shortly, the legal or judicial sense is rare in the former, and in St. Paul almost entirely absent. The verb "to justify" implies, quite usually, a really efficient action.

But to understand this efficiency, and the reality in the justified man of this justice which God confers upon him on the ground of and by means of faith, we must con-

sider the problem from another point of view—that of incorporation into Christ.

Let us point out before passing on that there would have been no difficulty from the point of view of Pauline doctrine in saying that God justifies the sinner by faith alone, if Luther had not falsified the meaning of this expression. For the Apostle, God justifies the sinner by faith, to the exclusion of works. In this sense, then, He justifies by faith alone, but it must be understood that this refers not to the final or second justification, but to the initial or primary—that of the sinner. But Luther tries to oppose faith (the idea of which he perverts) not to what St. Paul calls "works," but even to those interior movements to which faith naturally leads the sinner, and which find their fulfilment in "repentance." There is nothing Pauline in Luther's "faith alone." It is nothing but an exegetical and psychological paradox.

CHAPTER II

INCORPORATION INTO CHRIST

SUMMARY: I.—*Faith.* II.—*Baptism.* III.—*The Eucharist.*

I.—FAITH

THIS incorporation into Christ by which our justification is wrought is inaugurated by faith, realised in baptism, and consummated by the Eucharist. Faith, baptism, the Eucharist are the factors of what it is the custom to call St. Paul's mysticism—an ambiguous term.

Of these factors faith is the first. Endless are the antinomies, or at least dualisms, which some find in the thought of St. Paul. Thus, some would have the Pauline justification by faith and the Pauline mysticism of life in Christ to derive from two different theological systems, the one akin to the Jewish, simply substituting faith for works, the other of an Hellenistic character.

This is a gross mistake. Pauline faith, and the justification of which it is the foundation, are of themselves realities of the mystical or spiritual order—to be more precise, of the order of grace. Faith, in particular, which is the beginning of everything in us (Heb. xi, 6) is to begin with a gift of God, and in itself, as on our part, the starting-point of a sanctifying process.

THE NATURE OF FAITH.—To analyse Pauline faith, with anything like exactness, is an intricate business. To begin with, let us notice the striking expression in Rom. x, 17, which traces faith back to its objective origin: "Faith then cometh by hearing; and hearing (cometh) by the word of Christ." Again, we have in I Thess. ii, 13,

the following assertion: "We also give thanks to God . . . because that when you had received of us the word of the hearing of God, you received it . . . (as) the word of God." You received, to wit by faith, God's message, which is the same thing as the word of Christ, which you heard from our lips, i.e., which we preached to you, and it was to its authority as God's word that you submitted when you received it. Here we have the object of faith, its motive, and, as already appears, its nature as an intellectual adherence to the Gospel. This adherence St. Paul gladly terms an obedience: "Bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ" (II Cor. x, 5). Compare the statements with different shades of meaning, in Rom. i, 5; Gal. iii, 2; II Thess. i, 8; Rom. xvi, 26. This word obedience implies an intervention of the will in that assent of the mind which constitutes faith. "But thanks be to God," we read (Rom. vi, 17), "that you . . . have obeyed from the heart [by faith] unto that form of doctrine into which you have been delivered"; cf. Rom. x, 16. The definition of faith given in Heb. xi, 1, emphasizes, in regard to its object, this affective connotation. "Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not." Here we have a double formula, each term of which corresponds to and balances the other. This is particularly marked in "things to be hoped for" and "things that appear not"; and this comes out again in Rom. viii, 24. What is especially interesting is the expression, "things *hoped for*," by which St. Paul here defines the object of faith. We need not carry this analysis any further; it is enough to have brought out that the Pauline idea of faith implies a complex participation by the heart.

But we must carefully observe that this obedience of the intellect and the will in Pauline faith is altogether divine. Its object and motive is the word of God, and it

is preceded by the preaching of the Apostles commissioned by Christ. It is man's response to God's call, and as such finds a place in the list of saving acts enumerated in Rom. viii, 29, *seq.:* "For whom He foreknew, He also predestinated. . . . And whom He predestinated, them He also called [by the preaching of the Gospel, to which faith responds]. And whom He called [and who responded by faith], them also He justified. And whom He justified, them He also glorified." This response of faith is itself the joint work of God and man. For we read in II Thess. iii, 2: "All men have not faith." What can be the meaning of this saying which discriminates among men who have all alike had the Gospel preached to them, if not that faith is a gift of God? Still more explicit is Rom. xii, 3: "According as God hath divided to everyone the measure of faith." But no words of St. Paul afford deeper insight into the interior origin of faith and the capital importance of the part that God has in it than those in II Cor. iv, 6: "For God, Who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Christ Jesus." As a psychological reality, faith, it is already clear, is in its origin and nature a spiritual power, a reality of the order of grace, although as yet imperfect.

The Faith of Jesus Christ.—Pauline faith stands in a special relation to Jesus Christ. To express this relation we observe, to begin with, that St. Paul makes full use of all the prepositions and figures of speech at his disposal. We find *faith in Christ* (Gal. iii, 26; I Tim. iii, 13); *believing upon Christ* (Greek—εἰς) (Rom. x, 14; Gal. ii, 16; Philip. i, 29; Col. ii, 5); *faith founded on Christ* (Rom. x, 11); *faith towards Christ* (Philemon, 5); *faith which is in Christ* (II Tim. i, 13); *the faith of Jesus Christ* (Rom. iii, 22, 26; Gal. ii, 16, 20; iii, 22; Philip. iii, 9).

The diversity of these expressions brings out, when they are taken together, the rich complexity of faith as a psychological reality, and the manifoldness of the relationship into which it binds the believer and Christ. In particular, we receive once more the impression that faith, which is an assent of the mind, is something more than that, and that it gives rise immediately to various movements of the affections which extend its action.

There are a few sayings of the Apostle which help to fix more exactly, though, as it were, by-the-way, this manifold relationship of faith and the believer to Christ; as in Heb. xii, 2: "Looking on Jesus, the author and finisher of faith"; and in Ephes. iii, 17: "That Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts."

But we must look at the matter from another point of view and ask ourselves what this Christ is to Whom faith unites us. He is Jesus as Lord, and this Lord is Jesus risen from the dead (Rom. x, 9). And Jesus, Who died and is risen again, is our Saviour. Before the eye of faith—our faith which binds us to Him—arises what St. Paul calls "the mystery of Christ" (Ephes. iii, 4; Col. iv, 3); "the mystery of God the Father and of Christ Jesus" (Col. ii, 2); and it becomes, in Ephes. vi, 19, "the mystery of the gospel," that is to say, the great design formed and decreed by God from all eternity—and this wholly for Jesus Christ its object; a design which, hidden as it was for ages, is now revealed in the gospel and in the Church (Col. i, 26).

THE REDEEMER.—It is exactly this mystery of universal redemption and of universal salvation through faith which forms what St. Paul calls in his Epistle to the Galatians his "gospel," and which he claims to have received from Jesus Christ Himself, as also his apostolate, which is bound up with it. This has, no doubt, reference not to the material facts, but rather to their deeper

meaning and to the scope of their practical consequences.

In the outline which we are about to trace we will take as a starting-point—without, however, dwelling on it for the present—St. Paul's affirmation that Jesus Christ is God's own Son made man (Rom. i, 3, *seq.;* Philip. II, 5, *seq.;* Col. i, 13, *seq.;* Heb. i-iv). What, we may ask, was, in the mind of St. Paul, the motive which determined God to will this "emptying" of His Son? What was the divine plan, of which the Son of God, Who had shared in the forming of it, took upon himself the execution, in the humanity which he deigned to assume?

When for the first time he learned who Jesus was—and we may be fairly sure that it was through Stephen's fearless sermon—Paul the Jew found himself face to face with the Cross. He held it to be an absurd and blasphemous idea that this crucified Jesus could be God's Christ. But when he had the vision on the road to Damascus, his hitherto obstinate resistance suddenly broke down in face of the evidence of the glory of Jesus. He believed that Jesus was the Christ, and at the same time it was revealed to him by a divine illumination that Jesus had chosen him to carry His name before the Gentiles (Acts ix, 15, *seq.*).

Nevertheless, the scandal of the Cross was not altogether removed. The glory of the risen Christ masked it rather than explained it. How, and in what circumstances, God provided for his enlightenment, we do not know. But this enlightenment—to which St. Paul clung with all his faith, and which serves as a source of light for his system of thought—he owed to the idea of redemption. It was in the light of this specifically Christian idea that he interpreted for himself the fact of the Incarnation of the Son of God itself, and in that light that he realised for the first time in all its length and depth the dominion of sin over human nature, and the part

played by the Law and the whole economy of the old Covenant.

In I Corinth. xv, 1, *seq.*, we read: "Now I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you. . . . For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received: how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures. . . . And that He rose again the third day, according to the scriptures." Such is the fundamental statement, and it has the force of attested fact and common belief which, in the light which Christ has given him, he is about to develop into a systematic doctrine of Redemption necessary for all, and available for all through faith.

The Epistles of St. Paul are full of this doctrine (I Thess. v, 9, 10): "For God hath not appointed us unto wrath; but unto the purchasing of salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, Who died for us: that whether we watch or sleep, we may live together with Him."

In I Cor. i, 13, we learn that Christ has been crucified for us; in i, 30, that He "is made unto us . . . redemption"; in v, 7, that "Christ our pasch is sacrificed." Again, in chap. viii, 11, speaking of the giving of scandal, St. Paul inculcates the duty of consideration for "the brother for whom Christ hath died." Christ's resurrection, together with His death, plays an essential part in our redemption. So we read in I Cor. xv, 17: "And if Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain; for you are yet in your sins." St. Paul expresses his thought more fully in II Cor. v, 18, *seq.:* "But all things are of God, Who hath reconciled us to Himself by Christ . . . . For God indeed was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing to them their sins. . . . Him, who knew no sin, He hath made sin for us"—there, indeed, the word "impute" would fit in wonderfully well—"that we might be made the justice of God in Him." And in Gal. i,

3, *seq.*: "Grace be to you, and peace from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ, Who gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us from this present wicked world, according to the will of God and our Father" (cf. ii, 20).

The case is put from another point of view in Gal. iii, 13, *seq.*: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us (for it is written: *Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree*). That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Christ Jesus; that we may receive the promise of the Spirit by faith"; cf. Gal. iv, 4, *seq.*

Rom. iii, 21, *seq.*, is a passage of the first importance: "But now, without the law, the justice of God is made manifest, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Even the justice of God, by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe in Him: for there is no distinction. For all have sinned and do need the glory of God. Being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood, to the shewing of His justice, for the remission of former sins, through the forbearance of God, for the shewing of justice in this time." And again, Rom. iv, 23, *seq.*: "Now it is not written only for him [Abraham] that it [his faith] was reputed to him unto justice, But also for us, to whom it shall be reputed, if we believe in Him that raised up Jesus Christ our Lord from the dead, Who was delivered up for our sins and rose again for our justification." Also, a little further on, Rom, v, 6, *seq.*: "For why did Christ, when yet we were weak, according to the time, die for the ungodly? . . . But God commendeth His charity towards us: because when as yet we were sinners according to the time, Christ died for us. Much more therefore, being now justified by His blood, shall we be saved from wrath through Him. For if,

when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God . . ." cf. Rom. v, 15, *seq.*

The Epistles of the captivity expatiate even more, if possible, on this mystery of our redemption by Christ's death, ratified by His resurrection. So we read in Col. i, 19, *seq.*: "Because in Him [His beloved Son] it hath pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell: And through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself [in a special sense determined by the context], making peace through the blood of His Cross both as to the things that are on earth and the things that are in heaven. And you [Gentiles] whereas you were some time alienated and enemies in mind in evil works: Yet now both be reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and unspotted and blameless before Him." And yet again, in Col. ii, 14, *seq.*: "Blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, which was contrary to us [*i.e.* the Law to which, through non-observance, we have become debtors]. And He hath taken the same out of the way, fastening it to His Cross. And despoiling the principalities and powers [charged by God with the delivery of the Law; cf. Gal. iii, 19; Heb. ii, 2] He hath exposed them confidently in open shew, triumphing over them in the Cross."* Cf. Ephes. ii, 13, *seq.* In Ephes. i, 7, we come across an expression we have already met with: "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins."

The Pastoral Epistles, too, bear their witness to this mystery of Redemption. "For there is one God and one mediator of God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, Who gave Himself a redemption for all" (I Tim. ii, 5, 6). And cf. I Tim. i, 15. Again: ". . . . the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity and might cleanse

* Eng. vers., "in himself." (Trans.)

to Himself a people acceptable, a pursuer of good works" (Titus ii, 13, 14).

Finally, the Epistle to the Hebrews (we do not know whether it is the first of St. Paul's Epistles or one of the later ones) develops this same doctrine with reference to Christ's priesthood. After brief allusions to it in v, 2, *seq.*, and vi, 6, *seq.*, we have now a full exposition of it in ix, 11, *seq.* "But Christ, being come an high priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hand, that is, not of this creation: neither by the blood of goats or of calves, but by His own blood, entered once into the Holies, having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and oxen and the ashes of an heifer, being sprinkled, sanctify such as are defiled, to the cleansing of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, Who by the Holy Ghost offered Himself unspotted to God, cleanse our conscience from dead works, to serve the living God? And therefore He is the mediator of the new testament: that by means of His death for the redemption of those transgressions which were under the former testament, they that are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance"; cf. Heb. ix, 26; x, 10, *seq.;* xiii, 12, 20; and in the Catholic Epistles, I Pet., 2, *seq.;* ii, 21; I John i, 7; iv, 10, etc.

Such, then, is the development into a far-reaching Soteriology, which does but expound what it involves, of the simple statement which we met with in the Gospels and found again in the earlier chapters of the Acts. It dominates and permeates the special doctrine of justification. God justifies sinful man in consideration of the redemption accomplished by Christ. The faith by which sinful man disposes himself, on his side, to justification is pre-eminently faith in Christ the Redeemer. Here we reach the heart of St. Paul's doctrine, and of Christianity itself, and of this no explaining away

can weaken the force, no comparison with the object of softening its peculiar character can diminish the originality.

The universal scope of the death and redemption of Christ is, in Rom. v, 12, *seq.*, shown as analogous to the sin of Adam: "Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation; so also by the justice of one, unto all men to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners; so also by the obedience of one many shall be made just." That the death of Christ was a manifestation of obedience is an idea familiar to St. Paul (Philip. ii, 8; Heb. v, 8). "Made just"—on condition, of course, of the appropriation of the justifying and vivifying power of this Redemption, which, as such, is perfect.

II.—Baptism

This justifying union with Christ the Redeemer, which is entered upon by faith, in Baptism becomes an incorporation by which the work of faith is completed. "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved" is the declaration of Jesus (Mark xvi, 16). We meet again with this connection of faith with baptism both in St. Paul and in the primitive Church. The profession of faith is made in connection with baptism; and of this St. Paul says, in Rom. x, 9: "If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved." And this profession can be made only under the impulse of the Holy Spirit (I Cor. xii, 3).

Baptism in Christ Jesus.—From the first St. Paul asserts the intimate connection of baptism with Jesus Christ. So we have the well-established meaning of the

expression of which he is so fond, "baptised in [or into] Christ" (Rom. vi, 3; Gal. iii, 27)—a short and energetic expression which the Apostle proceeds to expound.

The Christ into Whom we are baptised is the Christ in Whom we believe, the Christ Who died for our sins and was raised again for our justification. "Know you not," writes St. Paul (Rom. vi, 3, *seq.*), "that all we who are baptised in Christ Jesus are baptised in His death? For we are buried together with Him by baptism into death: that, as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, to the end that we may serve sin no longer."

We find the same teaching in Col. ii, 11, *seq.*; and here faith plays its part in the actual process of baptism, so closely are they bound up with one another: "In Whom also you are circumcised with a circumcision not made by hand in despoiling of the body of the flesh; but in the circumcision of Christ. Buried with Him in baptism: in Whom also you are risen again by the faith of the operation of God, Who hath raised Him up from the dead." We now see that to be baptised in Christ means to be baptised in Christ's death and resurrection; and that a metaphor suggested by the rite of baptism by immersion but thinly veils a real participation in His death and in His resurrection.

This participation is spiritual, yet real; not moral—a mere changing of dispositions—but physical in its mode. What dies in us is "the old man"—"the body of sin," "the flesh," "the passions and concupiscences of the flesh" (Rom. vi-viii, 13; Gal. v, 13, *seq.*). We die to sin, and to all that furnished assistance to it in its dominion, including the Law (Gal. ii, 19).

What rises again is a "new creature": "If then any be in Christ a new creature," we read, in II Cor. v, 17. cf. Gal. vi, 15. A "new man": "Stripping yourselves of the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new, him who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of Him that created him" (Col. iii, 9, 10).

What, then, is this new man? It is Christ. "Where there is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free. But Christ is all and in all" (Col. iii, 11). Again, in Gal. iii, 27—where we find our original formula in clearer form—we read: "For as many of you as have been baptised in Christ have put on Christ." And, lastly, in Gal. ii, 19, 20: "With Christ I am nailed to the cross. And I live, now not I: but Christ liveth in me"; cf. Philip. i, 21.

Baptism in the Holy Spirit.—We now come into contact with another line of thought, which we might think to have no connection with what has gone before, or, indeed, to be of an entirely different character. In I Cor. xii, 13, we read: "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, bond or free: and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink." Ephes. iv, 4, 5, should be taken in a similar connection with baptism: "One body and one Spirit. . . . One Lord, one faith, one baptism." Similarly, again, the anointing and sealing mentioned in II Cor. i, 21, 22, are to be related to baptism: "He that confirmeth us with you in Christ and that hath anointed us, is God: Who also hath sealed us and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts"; cf. Ephes. i, 13. Finally, Titus iii, 5-7, is as clear as could be wished: "Not by the works of justice which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the laver of regeneration and renovation of the Holy Ghost. Whom He hath poured forth

upon us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour: That being justified by His grace, we may be heirs according to hope of life everlasting."

Thus we come back to the proclamation of St. John the Baptist relative to the Messianic baptism with the Holy Ghost (John i, 33), and to the declaration by Jesus Himself to Nicodemus, in John iii, 1, *seq.*, and to the disciples before His Ascension (Acts i, 5; cf. Acts xi, 16).

At baptism, then, the believer receives the Holy Ghost, Whose temple he becomes and henceforth the Holy Ghost dwells in Him (Rom. viii, 9, *seq.*). But with the Holy Spirit, and from Him, he receives a "spirit"—a *pneuma*—which represents a positive reality, distinct both from his own human spirit and the Holy Spirit (Gal. iii, 3; vi, 8). In Rom. viii, 2, it is termed "the spirit of life"; in II Cor. iv, 13, "the spirit of faith"; and cf. many other places.

Now, what is the relation between baptism in Jesus Christ and baptism in the Holy Spirit? Between the new man—the new creature—and the spirit or *pneuma?* There can be no doubt that for St. Paul the new man or new creature which baptism produces in us is the same spirit for which we are indebted to baptism in the Holy Spirit. Similarly, the life of Jesus Christ and the life of the Holy Spirit in the baptised are, broadly, one and the same life. It is clear that this double identity supposes an intimate relation between Christ Himself and the Holy Spirit. What is that relation?

We find St. Paul on many occasions when he is speaking of the Holy Spirit uses, indifferently, as it would seem, the expressions, "the Spirit of God" (as in Rom. viii, 9, 11, 14, etc.), and "the Spirit of Christ" (as in Rom. viii, 9; II Cor. iii, 18; Gal. iv, 6; Philip. i, 19, etc.). The Holy Spirit Whom the baptised person receives is, then, the Spirit of Christ. This is not the time to define in what sense this is so. Only let us discard the idea of

an identity, properly so-called, between the glorified Christ and the Spirit—an identity which a considerable number of critics would have to be explicitly asserted in II Cor. iii, 17: "Now the Lord is the Spirit."* We have but to read a little further to see that here is no case of identity: "Where *the Spirit of the Lord* is there is liberty." Yet, if there is no identity between Christ and the Spirit, considered in themselves these two expressions, "Christ, in us," and "the Holy Spirit in us," are practically equivalent. "But you are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His. And if Christ be in you. . . ." (Rom. viii, 9, 10).

As we work out the subtle implications of Pauline formulas we are led to perceive an even more precise identification: viz., that of the life of Christ in the baptised person with the spirit, or *pneuma*, which the Spirit of Christ imparts to us in baptism as a positive reality, and which becomes ours by a permanent right of possession. We shall see farther on that this spirit is nothing else than what later theology calls sanctifying grace.

This spirit—a communication of the Spirit of Christ—is presented to our minds as an actual reality in I Cor. i, 30: "But of Him [God] are you in Christ Jesus, Who of God is made unto us wisdom and justice and sanctification and redemption." Here we are far from a justice merely imputed by a juridical sentence, and having no real existence in ourselves, or, at least, no other reality than that afforded by faith alone.

The Body of Christ.—"For in one Spirit were we all baptised into one body" (I Cor. xii, 13). This "one body" is the body of Christ. We become, in baptism, the body of Christ, precisely by reason of the spirit, or

* Eng. version: "is a Spirit." (Trans.)

pneuma, which we receive from Him (and from the Holy Spirit). Baptism, by uniting us to Christ, considered as a person, incorporates us into the mystical Christ, which we understand to consist of Christ Himself and all those who have been admitted into vital fellowship with Him in baptism. The body of Christ is the Church; and the mystical Christ is Christ and the Church. In relation to His body, the Church, Christ stands as the head. In the body of Christ, the Church, the function of the baptised is that of distinct and differentiated members. We shall see further on precisely whence springs this differentiation, for which baptism does not account, at least, taken by itself, and without reference other than to the spirit which it originates.

Here we will be content with citing the great passages from the Epistles of the Captivity, in which the thought of St. Paul is declared with masterly clearness and fulness. Ephes. i, 23, 24: "[God] hath made Him head over all the Church, which is His body and the fulness of Him [Christ] Who is filled all in all." Col. i, 18: "And He is the head of the body, the Church; Who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things He may hold the primacy"; cf. ii, 19; Ephes. iv, 15, 16; v, 23.

Since this is the case we ought not to be surprised to find that St. Paul presents as the object of baptism, and of the Passion itself—to which baptism, as does faith, owes its power—the sanctification of the Church, the body of Christ: "As Christ also loved the Church and delivered Himself up for it: That He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water [baptism] in the word of life [the baptismal formula, which must be the trinitarian formula stated in Matt. xxviii, 19]; That He might present it to Himself, a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing" (Ephes. v, 25, *seq.*). Let us notice the distinct allusion to the entire

purification or remission of sins in baptism, a purification or remission which is evidently wrought by the communication of the spirit. So also in I Cor. vi, 11.

We observe, too, how the Synoptic idea of the Church gains in depth in the writings of St. Paul; in the Synoptics it is represented as a building (an image which, however, is often found in St. Paul's Epistles), the exterior and social form of the Kingdom. But this deepening is brought about without having recourse to elements from any outside source, but by a simple combination of two orders of evangelical deliveries. These are the notions of Reign and Realm and of Life, the theme of Christ-the-King and of Christ-the-Life. This latter theme is very suggestively expounded in the allegorical parable of the Vine, in John xv, 1, *seq.*

III.—The Eucharist

Baptism, with faith, incorporates us into Christ, and this, as we have seen, implies between Him and ourselves a true community of life, of which the principle in us is the spirit which we receive from the Spirit of God and of Christ. It is the work of the Eucharist to consummate this incorporation, together with this community of life. The principle remains: one spirit uniting into one body. St. Paul—at any rate in the sphere of typical history—means, seemingly, to connect the Eucharist with baptism. So we read in I Cor. x, i, *seq.*: ". . . our fathers were all under the cloud: and all passed through the sea. And all in Moses were baptised, in the cloud and in the sea: And did all eat the same spiritual food: And drank the same spiritual drink." The passage through the Red Sea is a figure of baptism; the spiritual food and drink—viz., the manna and the water springing out of the rock (which was Christ)—are a figure of the Eucharist. Like baptism, and even more closely, the

Eucharist is linked with Christ's Passion: "For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice you shall show the death of the Lord, until He come" (I Cor. xi, 26). It is the official memorial of the Passion.

That, however, is not all; it contains the sacrificed Christ: "This is My body which shall be delivered for you . . . this chalice is the new testament in my blood" (I Cor. xi, 24, 25).

In the Eucharist, then, is found all that is required to complete the incorporation of the baptised person into Christ, the Redeemer, Sanctifier and Life-giver. For St. Paul the very matter of the sacrament symbolises the unity of the body of Christ: "For we, being many, are one bread, one body." But what is it when compared with the reality of which it is the Sacrament? "The chalice of benediction which we bless [i.e. the cup over which the Eucharistic benediction has been pronounced] is it not [for him who drinks of it] the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break [in the Eucharistic fraction], is it not [when we feed upon it] the partaking of the [natural] body of Christ" (I Cor. x, 16). And cf. I Cor. xi, 27.

Consequent upon this act of eating the body of Christ and drinking His blood is effected, as by food, a spiritual nourishment of that spirit of Christ in us, which forms the essential reality of our vital union with Him and of our incorporation unto Him.

Baptism and the Eucharist, which are factors of the first importance in Pauline "mysticism," are themselves realities of the mystical order, endowed with an efficiency of their own, though dependent on the Holy Spirit and Christ. The weight of evidence is forcing an increasing number of contemporary critics to acknowledge that for St. Paul they are "sacraments." It matters not that they misunderstand the meaning of the term and regard sacraments as magical rites. The mistake is, of

course, a gross one, but it does not lessen the force of their admission. It may be said that on this point, so vigorously contested by the Liberal school, the Catholic contention is signally victorious.

It is true that the majority of these same critics see in St. Paul's conception of sacraments a clear case of syncretism and the evident proof of the penetration of pagan "mysteries" into his theology. There are no grounds for this supposition, since all likelihood goes the other way; and, moreover, it is seen to be valueless when one takes the trouble to examine the comparisons by means of which its justification is attempted.

Without entering upon the discussion, we may remark, to end with, that the Pauline doctrine on baptism and the Eucharist is in entire agreement with that of St. Peter, St. John, and the Synoptics.

Baptism, according to St. Peter and St. John.—By these it is represented as the sacrament of our regeneration as children of God. John i, 12, *seq.:* "But as many as received Him [evidently by faith] He gave them power to be made the sons of God, to them that believe in His name. Who are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This birth, or re-birth, is effected in baptism by the action of the Holy Spirit, and results in the regenerate in the "spirit" taking the place of the "flesh" (John iii, 1, *seq.*). It is to this re-birth that the baptised person owes the character of a child of God (I John ii, 29; iii, 9; iv, 7; v, 1, 4, 18).

We find the same idea, more briefly expressed, in I Pet. i, 3, 23: "Being born again not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God who liveth and remaineth for ever." Even in James i, 18, we find an echo of this: "For of His own will hath [God] begotten us by the word of truth, that we might be some

beginning of His creature." However, there is here no direct allusion to baptism.

Compared with that of St. John, the "mystical" doctrine of baptism of St. Paul gives us the impression of being more circumspect. It inclines to modify the force of the terms regeneration and sons by a frequent use of the word adoption, and by a careful emphasis of our mutual relation with Jesus Christ, Who is Himself the first-born Son, the true Son. Let us recall a few texts: "For whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For . . . you have received the spirit of adoption of sons whereby we cry: Abba, [Father]. For the Spirit Himself giveth testimony to our spirit that we are the sons of God. And if sons, heirs also, heirs indeed of God and joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. vii, 14, *seq.*). Cf. Rom. viii, 23, where our adoption is represented as still imperfect and an object of hope. Also Gal. iv, 5; Ephes. i, 5. And in our co-ordination with Christ and subordination to Him—otherwise so forcibly expressed in the doctrine of incorporation—Rom. viii, 29: "For whom He foreknew, He also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of His Son: that He might be the first-born amongst many brethren." Cf. I Cor. xv, 49; II Cor. iii, 18, etc.

The Eucharist in the Synoptics and St. John.—St. Paul's Eucharistic doctrine is solidly based upon the Synoptic accounts of the Last Supper, which in turn it confirms. In both cases we find the same realism in the formulas which signify and effect the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, which His disciples eat and drink.

Can one wish for a more striking and illuminating exposition of what St. Paul sets forth than the Eucharistic discourse of Jesus Christ in the sixth chapter of St. James' Gospel? "Amen, amen, I say unto you: except

you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath everlasting life. . . . He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father: so he that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me" (St. John vi, 54, *seq.*).

Or, again, when Christ says: "It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh [by itself and in itself alone] profiteth nothing"—what light these words throw upon the subject of the nourishment of the soul, or rather, of the spirit received in baptism, which is sanctifying grace!

CHAPTER III

THE NEW LIFE

SUMMARY: I.—*The new man.* II.—*The virtues of the new man.* III.—*The special graces of the new man.* IV.—*The life of the new man.*

I.—THE NEW MAN

SINCE the new life is a life, that is to say, the activity of a living being, and since this living being is the new man formed in us in baptism, we are led to further consideration of this new man in order to examine more closely St. Paul's mind on the subject.

The new man is the fruit of divine operations which the Apostle describes, as the case may be, by the use of the verbs *to create*, *to raise again*, *to beget again*, and *to adopt*—God being the operator. In connection more especially with the last two of these verbs, St. Paul gives to the new man the corresponding names of son or child of God and of brother of Jesus Christ.

Now, what is the content of this term, the new man? Firstly, two realities—that of Christ living in us, and that of the Holy Spirit, Who is given to us, dwells in us, and becomes the mover of our actions; two realities, of which the second gives a concrete quality to, and accounts for, the former. But is there nothing left in us of our own? Is the new man nothing else than a new psychology in us, directly attributable to the Holy Spirit? The force of the verbs noted above and the general realistic quality of St. Paul's language would

hardly lead us to think so. The new man, according to which, having been begotten again by God, we become His sons, certainly stands in the mind of the Apostle for something more stable and, so to speak, something more substantial than a mere mentality.

THE SPIRIT.—We have already noticed that there is present in the baptised a "spirit" which is opposed to the flesh and is neither the Holy Spirit nor our human spirit. That this spirit is itself a reality is clearly seen from Rom. viii, 16, which should probably be translated, "The [Holy] Spirit Himself bears witness together with the spirit [of adoption, v. 15] that we are children of God." The word "spirit" is very often found in this same sense in these Epistles. Cf. Rom. viii, 2, 4, *seq.;* Gal. iii, 3; v, 17, 25; vi, 8; Ephes. iv, 3, *seq.;* I Cor. ii, 12; vi, 17, etc. In a large number of cases one is more and more inclined to read "spirit" in the place of [Holy] "Spirit," though the distinction is not easily made.

In the baptised person this *pneuma* may be said to take the same place as does the *psyche* in the unregenerate man. The natural man is a *psychic* man, the Christian —the real Christian—is a *pneumatic* man.* This is so at least in the innermost sphere of reality, of the very being. For in the sphere of activity the Christian can behave as a *carnal* man (I Cor. ii, 10, *seq.*, and iii).

It is this *pneuma* which constitutes the resemblance of the baptised person to Jesus Christ. "The first man, Adam, was made into a living soul [*psyche*], the last Adam into a quickening spirit [*pneuma*]. Yet that was not first which was spiritual [*pneumatic*], but that which was natural [*psychic*]" (I Cor. xv, 45, 46). And there is a likeness even to God, for "God is spirit [*pneuma*]" (John

* *Psychic; pneumatic*; are rendered in the English Bible: *Sensual* and *spiritual*—I Cor. ii, 14, 15. (Trans.)

iv, 24); though more precisely to the divine nature, which, in Jesus Christ, St. Paul describes by the term "spirit [*pneuma*] of sanctification" (Rom. i, 4), which does not refer to the Holy Spirit.

This is the explanation of the words used in Col iii, 10: "And putting on the new [man], him who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of [God] that created him." Cf. Ephes. iv, 24, where we read: "according to God." Doubtless this refers to conformity in the life, but it implies a previous conformity of nature. Besides, this spirit, which we have received from the Holy Spirit, and according to which we are made like unto God, Whose sons we have become, and to Christ, Whose brethren we now are, is itself intended to increase till we reach the state of the perfect man, "unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ" (Ephes. iv, 13).

This analysis of the *pneuma* according to St. Paul leads directly to the noble passage in II Pet. i, 3, *seq.:* "As all things of His divine power which appertain to life and godliness are given us through the knowledge of Him Who hath called us by His own proper glory and virtue [i.e. God]. By Whom* He hath given us most great and precious promises, that by these you may be made partakers of the divine nature." This partaking of the divine nature, with which we have been endowed in fulfilment of the ancient promises, is the *pneuma* of St. Paul.

To indicate this, St. Paul also uses two other terms—*charis* and *charisma*. Like *pneuma*, each has more than one meaning. *Charis* denotes sometimes divine favour, a saving favour, and sometimes the gifts it brings us. The latter sense is required in some contexts, and seemingly more often than current exegeses, in the time of the Liberal School, thought to be the case. At any rate, there is no

* Fr., "by which"—*par lesquelles.*

doubt about it in Rom. v, 17. "For if by one man's offence death reigned through one, much more they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift, and of justice, shall reign in life through one Jesus Christ."

Here St. Paul is speaking not of the divine favour, but of a gift which it bestows upon us, and that a gift which is quite precisely, justifying and sanctifying grace. Such is the case, too, in Rom. v, 20, 21, and I Pet. i, 10.

The world *charisma* always denotes a gift of God, a gratuitous gift. But this gift may be either a special spiritual faculty (endowments, graces freely given), or sanctifying grace. This sense is required in Rom. v, 15, 16, where *charisma* and *charis* are equivalent. So, too, in Rom. vi, 23: "For the wages of sin is death. But the gift* (*charisma*) of God, life everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lord." This equivalence between *charisma* (sanctifying grace) and life eternal is one to be consummated at last rather than one actually existing: "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, you have your fruit unto sanctification and the end life everlasting" (Rom. vi, 22).

This equivalence in the end enables us to correlate quite easily the Pauline doctrine of the *pneuma-charis-charisma*, or sanctifying grace, with that of St. John on eternal life. Read, for instance, John iv, 13: "Jesus answered and said to her: Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again: but he that shall drink of the water that I will give him shall not thirst for ever. But the water that I will give him shall become in him a fountain of water springing up into life everlasting." Here is exactly the thought of Rom. vi, 22, *seq.* Cf. also John iii, 6: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh: and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Here we have a no less striking agreement between St. Paul and St. John on the very use of the term *pneuma*.

* Eng. Bible: grace. (Trans.)

This antithesis between flesh and spirit—so characteristic of St. Paul—warns us not to exaggerate the difference, real as it may be, which is to be noticed in the manner in which St. Paul and St. John respectively regard grace. Père Rousselot expresses it thus: "St. John is absorbed in contemplation of the divine life communicated to men by Jesus Christ; he presents grace as a *new nature* which *dwells* in us and, *raising* us above our earthly-condition, constitutes us *sons of God.* St. Paul—at least the St. Paul of the Epistle to the Romans—dwells upon the conversion of sinful man; especially does he seem to conceive of grace as a divine aid, given from heaven out of pure mercy, which heals the wounded will, changes it, brings it back from evil to good with a wonderful gentleness and (above all) power. Here are two conceptions of grace . . . . ." *

As a matter of fact, both conceptions are found in each writer, but the second is, it is true, more marked in St. Paul than in St. John. However, cf. I St. John.

II.—The Virtues of the New Man

For a right understanding of the Pauline doctrine of the virtues we must start from this *pneuma*, on the nature of which we take leave to quote, in order to confirm and recall what we have said above, the following remarks of Père Lagrange: "The Epistle to the Romans (vii, 15, *seq.*) deals only with the conflict of the human faculties in man before the act of faith; here (Gal. v, 16, *seq.*) there is already at work a divine energy; the act of faith has been made. The Protestants infer from it that the spirit is therefore 'evidently' the Spirit of God. But in another passage (Rom. viii, 1, *seq.*), which is exactly parallel to this we are dealing with,

* P. Rousselot, *La grace d'après saint Jean et d'après saint Paul*, in *Recherches de science religieuse.* 1928 (Mélanges Grandmaison), p. 87.

the spirit is incontestably acquired by man as a permanent element of his own character; that is to say, as it is put elsewhere, man has become spiritual—*pneumatikos* (I Cor. ii, 13). There is, then, between the human faculties (we would say, between the soul* itself) and the Spirit of God this middle term, the participated spirit, which Catholic theology calls grace."†

Of this grace—of this sanctifying grace, to be precise—the virtues, as St. Paul conceives them,—viz., as stable and vital principles of spiritual activity,—are the proper organs.

The Theological Virtues.—By this name later theology designates the virtues of faith, hope, and charity, which are directly referred to God. With them St. Paul is acquainted, and they form for him a privileged triad, whose activity constitutes the substance of the Christian life, and is the true mark of the new man: "And now there remain faith, hope, charity, these three . . . ." (I Cor. xiii, 13). Faith. as we have seen, is seated in the intellect, but considered as under the motive-power of the will. Hope and charity are in the heart, or, better, in the will. All appear as permanent and clearly-specified emanations of the *pneuma*, or of grace; they are what we know as the infused theological virtues.

Faith, which was the beginning of justification, still continues after the effectuation of justification by grace, evidently in a new and more perfect condition, for we find it styled *pneuma* in II Cor. iv, 13. It is the foundation of the new life, Col. i, 23; its rule, Rom. xiv, 23; I Tim. i, 3; its principle, I Thess. i, 3; II Thess. i, 11. It constitutes its assurance, I Tim. iii, 13; its security, Ephes. vi, 16; I Thess. v, 8. It grows with the progress of the

* Text—*psyché*.

† *Epître aux Galates*. Paris, 1928. p. 147.

new life, Rom. i, 17; Gal. ii, 20. It makes Christ to dwell in us, Ephes. iii, 17. Nevertheless it is "in part," and is destined to be "done away" in the face to face vision of God (1 Cor. xiii).

Hope and faith are on a par with one another(I Cor. xiii). Hope owes its existence and its function to the imperfection of faith, which, since it does not give to us the vision of God, does not secure for us actual possession of it (Rom. viii, 24, *seq.*). Its object is salvation (Rom. viii, 24, *seq.;* I Thess. v, 8); the adoption or the manifestation of the children of God (Rom. viii, 18, *seq.);* glory (Rom. v, 2; Col. i, 27); life eternal (Titus i, 2; ii, 13; iii, 7). It "confoundeth not" (Rom. v, 5), for it has as its warrant God's love for us—of which we have a pledge in the death of Christ on our behalf—the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and the sovereign efficacy of the divine decrees. Trial confirms it (Rom. viii, 28, *seq.*, etc.). It is the source of interior confidence (II Cor. iii, 12; Heb. iii, 6; and of joy, Rom. xii, 12).

Charity is the greatest of the theological virtues (I Cor. xiii, 13). Charity gives saving force to all the others, and especially to all that important and manifold activity of special graces which St. Paul sets side by side with it (I Cor. xiii). Still more, it contains within itself, in some sort, the whole life of the new man, especially in his relation to his neighbour: "Charity is patient, is kind; charity envieth not, dealeth not perversely; is not puffed up. Is not ambitious, seeketh not her own, is not provoked to anger, thinketh no evil. Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth: Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things" (I Cor. xiii, 4, *seq.*). Even the virtues of faith and hope, though distinct from it, are directly moved by it. It is by charity that faith becomes active (Gal. v, 6). It is pre-eminently the gift of the Holy Spirit (Rom. xv, 30; Gal. v, 13); the foundation of the

new life (Ephes. iii, 17), and its perfection (Gal. iii, 11). Unlike faith and hope, it will never come to an end (I Cor. xiii, 8).

St. Paul speaks of charity towards God (II Cor. viii, 1, *seq.*); charity towards Christ (II Cor. v, 14). Ordinarily, however, even when he does not exactly state its object, it means for him fraternal charity. It is to fraternal charity that he refers in Rom. xiii, 10, when he says that is the fulfilling of the law. The emphasis given here to fraternal charity recalls the words of Jesus given in John xiii, 34, *seq.*, and St. John's insistence upon the same theme (I John, *passim*).

The Moral Virtues.—So, then, the *pneuma*, or sanctifying grace manifests its primary and proper activity in the life as directed towards God, in which it has as its organs the three virtues of faith, hope, and charity. But its activity considerably exceeds this sphere, and issues in morality strictly so-called. It is an essential characteristic of the spirituality of St. Paul that it is moral—positively and intensely moral; and this distinguishes it from other schools of spirituality with which critics of the synovetistic comparative school would fain assimilate it. But the converse is no less true. The moral life of the Christian is, for St. Paul, altogether pneumatic (spiritual). This, in a word, amounts to the affirmation of the moral character of sanctifying grace (*pneuma*) from whichever of the two points of view it is regarded. Sanctifying grace (*pneuma*) displays a moralising activity; Christian morality is altogether spiritual in origin and quality. There is no duality; Christian life is a perfect and complete unity.

It is from charity, pre-eminently the organ of the *pneuma*, that Christian morality springs. As we have gathered from I Cor. xiii, this is in some sort wholly contained in it. It may be said that it is by charity

directly that the *pneuma* proves itself to be the promoter of our moral activity.

Nevertheless, we find St. Paul mentioning, as if distinct, forms of moral activity which can be regarded only as virtues; that is to say, as stable and specific principles of moral activity. It is these virtues which effect what, as we have just seen, charity itself seems to do; or, to combine these two points of view—different but not irreconcilable—it is by means of them that charity does its work.

Now this suggests that we should regard these distinct moral virtues as instruments of, or let us say rather, emanations from, charity, and by it from the *pneuma*, from the infused virtues. There is no suggestion of a morality of merely natural origin and character produced by charity from outside, as it were, and made to serve its own ends. According to St. Paul, Christian morality is essentially pneumatic. It takes its rise in sanctifying grace, under the form of infused moral virtues. It is a real part of the life of the new man, the child of God.

But if St. Paul's thought as regards the notion of the moral virtues that are infused or derived from the *pneuma* is expressed with a clarity which is not sufficiently recognised, the same cannot be said with regard to their enumeration and nomenclature. Nowhere do we find St. Paul even attempting to draw up a complete and systematic list of them. He mentions them and commends them, but we cannot be sure even that different names denote, always and everywhere, distinct virtues. To elucidate the subject, so far as that can be done, detailed and carefully worked-out monographs would be needed, and these do not yet exist, and we cannot dream of undertaking the work here.

We must content ourselves with a bald enumeration of the virtues most frequently mentioned: prudence

(I Tim. iii, 2; Titus ii, 5, 6; Ephes. i, 8); justice (I Tim. vi, 11; Titus i, 8; II Tim. ii, 22); piety (I Tim. ii, 2; iv, 7, 8; vi, 11); fortitude (I Cor. xv, 58); confidence (*fiducia*) (II Cor. iii, 4, 12); patience (II Thess. i, 4; Rom. xv, 4; Col. iii, 12); chastity (I Tim. iv, 12; II Cor. vi, 6 [purity]); modesty (II Cor. x, 1; Philip. iv, 5; Col. iii, 12); humility (Col. iii, 12); etc.

III.—The Special Graces (Charismata) of the New Man.

We have now to deal with spiritual gifts of a type very different from those we have so far met with. Their function is not, as is that of grace and the virtues, both theological and moral, to make the Christian who possesses and exercises them god-like, and to sanctify him. In I Cor. xii, 7, St. Paul writes of them: "And the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man [for in principle each Christian shares in it] unto [the common] profit"—to the service of the Christian community; and to bring out clearly that they have no necessary connection with the sanctity and merits before God of the person to whom they are granted, he adds: "But all these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every one according as He will" (I Cor. xii, 11).

These gifts, then, or charismata, constitute a separate order, that of the gratuitous graces, altogether different from the order of sanctifying grace and the infused virtues.

But in their own particular sphere, which is that of the common profit and the service of the Church, St. Paul esteems them very highly, even though he holds them to be much inferior to charity and to the other virtues of the order of sanctification. "I give thanks," he writes in I Cor. i, 4, *seq.*, "to my God always for you for the grace of God [not sanctifying, but charis-

matic] that is given you in Christ Jesus. That in all things you are made rich in Him, in all utterance and in all knowledge: as the testimony of Christ [the Gospel] was confirmed in you. So that nothing is wanting to you in any grace, waiting for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ."

It is the diversity of these charismata which distinguishes the members of Christ's body, that is, of the Church. The possession of the *pneuma,* or sanctifying grace, does indeed make Him belong to the body, but it is not sufficient to establish the Christian in the position of a differentiated member commissioned to exercise for the common profit of the body a definite vital function. Hence the importance, for St. Paul, of the charismata; without them there is no organised body of Christ. "For the body also is not one member, but many. . . . But now God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased Him. And if they all were one member, where would be the body?" (I Cor. xii, 14, 18, 19).

On four different occasions—Rom. xii, 3, *seq.;* I Cor. xii, 1, *seq.*, 28, *seq.;* Ephes. iv, 7, *seq.*—St. Paul enumerates these charismata, but not according to strict system; perhaps he did not even intend to mention all. Here is the list given in I Cor. xii, 28, *seq.:* "And God indeed hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors, after that miracles, then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues, interpretation of speeches." St. Paul, as we know, does not rank all the charismata equally. One would like to suspect in the enumeration given above some concern to establish an order of value. It is not of their essence to be miraculous.

Besides these Epistles, the Acts makes mention of the charismata—ii, 4, *seq.;* x, 46; xix, 6, etc. So, too, in I Pet. iv, 10, 11, we read: "As every man hath received

grace, ministering the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak let him speak as the words of God. If any man minister, let him do it as of the power which God administereth: that in all things God may be honoured." Cf. Rom. xii, 3, *seq.*

The charismata are always in the possessor in constant and entire dependence on the Holy Spirit; nevertheless, the exterior exercise of them remains voluntary (I Cor. xiv, 26, *seq.*).

This means, then, that in grace and the virtues on the one hand and the charismata on the other, the Christian enjoys two quite distinct sets of spiritual gifts, the first ordered to personal sanctification, the second to that of the community. The second, which is inferior to the first, is subject to this as to its rule, and ordered to it as to its end. Faith and, still more, charity stand in relation to the charismata as supreme in value. As regards charity, I Cor. xiii is as clear as can be. Ephes. iv, 11, *seq.*, exhibits the charismata as put at the service of faith, which, on the other hand, is their sovereign rule: "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors. For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Until we all meet into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ."

The Gifts of the Holy Spirit.—Bordering on these two sets of spiritual gifts, we meet with certain special spiritual activities which, though closely connected with the charismata, nevertheless seem rather to be dependent on the spiritual system of sanctifying grace, and suggest what later theology calls the Gifts of the Holy Ghost. These active qualities, however, which

belong to the order of spiritual consciousness, find but a very small place in these Epistles—a place which they have, as it were, to defend against the encroachments of the charismata. The only two places in which there appears to be a reference to them are I Cor. ii, 7, *seq.*, and Col. i, 9. In the first-mentioned we read: "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden, which God ordained before the world, unto our glory. . . . But, as it is written: *That eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him.* But to us God hath revealed them by His Spirit. For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of a man that is in him? So the things that are of God no man knoweth but the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of this world, but the Spirit that is of God: that we may know the things that are given us from God." And in Col. i, 9: "Therefore we also . . . beg that you may be filled with the knowledge of His will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding." It does seem that the Apostle's thought is moving in the sphere of sanctifying grace and of the gifts which depend on it rather than in that of the charismata, though, as it were, their near presence is felt. At any rate, the special doctrine of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit can hardly be said to find a place in St. Paul's grand twofold system of spiritual gifts, which is somewhat surprising. However, compare again Ephes. v, 18, *seq.*

Charismatic Gifts and the Hierarchy.—The organisation of the Church, the body of Christ, is referred by St. Paul to the charismata. None the less, he is acquainted with an hierarchical organisation of the Church, distinct, by reason of its very origin—Jesus Christ—from the charismatic organisation. It is evident,

for instance, that he does not attribute the authority to teach and to govern, with which he holds this hierarchy to be invested, to the abundance of the charismata with which it is endowed, but to the apostolate to which Christ has called it. The officers whom He appoints in the churches founded by Him—or which He commands His delegates to appoint—deacons and priest-bishops (Acts xiv, 22, and Pastoral Epistles, *passim*)—represent, by reason of their origin, an organisation which is hierarchical and not charismatic. Here it seems is another duality, and an important one. However, two things must be noticed. The first is this: that there can be no question of considering these two organizations as of strictly diverse characters; both are essentially charismatic. The hierarchical heads themselves receive charismata appropriate to their functions (I Tim. iv, 14, and, more by implication, Acts xx, 28). Compare also the reference in Acts vi, 6, etc., to the laying-on of hands as a rite by which authority and charismatic qualifications are imparted. The difference between the two orders—charismatic and hierarchical—is shown chiefly in this—that those who are endowed with pure charismata receive them directly from the Holy Ghost, Who bestows them according to His good pleasure, while the possessors of hierarchical charismata are chosen by the heads of the Churches, and receive the gifts through the rite of the laying-on of hands, though in the last analysis from the Holy Ghost (Acts xx, 28). Yet it is to be noticed that the bestowal of pure charismata also seems to be linked with a rite of the imposition of hands(Acts x, 46; xix, 6, *seq.*); that this is a monopoly of the chief rulers of the Church, and is not, therefore, independent of the hierarchical authority.

The second thing to be noticed is that the hierarchical authority (as appears to have been the case with St.

Paul, I Cor. xii-xiv) exercises the acknowledged power of controlling and regulating the public exercise of the charismata. The charismatic organisation appears, then, to be subordinate to the hierarchical organisation, though otherwise not different in character.

IV.—The Life of the New Man

The old life and the new life.—St. Paul first defines the new life of the baptised person by contrasting it with the old life of the sinner. "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, so as to obey the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of iniquity unto sin; but present yourselves to God as those that are alive from the dead; and your members as instruments of justice unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you" (Rom. vi, 12, *seq.*).

As the new life is delivered from the empire of sin, so is it freed from the dominion of the flesh. "For they that are according to the flesh mind the things that are of the flesh; but they that are according to the spirit mind the things that are of the spirit. For the wisdom* of the flesh is death; but the wisdom of the spirit is life and peace. Because the wisdom of the flesh is an enemy to God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither can it be. And they who are in the flesh cannot please God. But you are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His" (Rom. viii, 5, *seq.*). Cf. Gal. iii, 1, *seq.*, and v.

Does this mean that according to St. Paul the Christian becomes impeccable? There are those who maintain this; but it is contrary to the evidence of the texts taken as a whole. Sin, though done away with in the

* Fr. text: *Les tendances*—"The inclinations of the flesh lead to death," etc. (Trans.)

man himself, can revive through the concupiscences of the flesh, which—since they belong in some sort to the very constitution of the body—have not disappeared entirely. The great change that has taken place is this: that the baptised person, now endowed with the *pneuma*, or sanctifying grace, has it in his power to dominate them effectually. But his final liberation from them will not be brought about until the carnal body shall have been transformed into a spiritual body. Until then, as St. Paul's language and definite assertions show—and in particular his urgent exhortations to live according to the spirit—sin remains possible for the baptised. Scores of passages from his Epistles might be cited in proof of this. But it must be acknowledged that we have need of further light on the real state of the new man and the precise conditions of the new life, which the Epistles of St. Paul do not provide.

As he is freed from sin and from the flesh, so, too, is the new man delivered from the Law; and we gather that by the Law St. Paul means a complete system of discipline (*régime*)—"the old ministration of the letter," with which is contrasted "the new ministration of the spirit" (Rom. vii, 6; II Cor. iii, 5, *seq.*). But he refers also, and quite especially, to that body of commandments and observances which made up Judaism, and which he terms "weak and needy elements" (Gal. iv, 9).

As a result, St. Paul is led to present the new life as a freedom. He is very fond of this term, which he uses over and over again, and avoids even the appearance of disowning it. Rather than do so, when he would warn against any practical abuse of it, he prefers to say: "All things are lawful for me; but all things are not expedient. All things are lawful for me, but all things do not edify" (I Cor. x, 22, 23).

Or, again, over against this principle of Christian liberty he sets another principle, superior to the former,

that of charity, and the claims of this are supreme (I Cor. viii, 2, *seq.;* Gal. v, 13).

Above all, he explains that this Christian liberty is not the liberty of the flesh, but the liberty of the spirit; and even, carried away by his earnestness, will go so far as to say that in fact we have but passed from one servitude to another, from slavery to sin and the flesh, to that of justice, of the spirit, and of God (Rom. vi, 15, *seq.;* viii, 2, *seq.*).

In his description, too, of the state of the new man, in Gal. v, 13, *seq.*, he expresses himself in terms which not only rudely dispel any illusion we may retain as to impeccability, but even incline us to ask ourselves in what consists the change from the state of the sinful, i.e. the unregenerate, man, described in Rom. vii. St. Paul writes thus forcibly: "For you, brethren, have been called unto liberty. Only make not liberty an occasion to the flesh. . . . I say then: Walk in the spirit: and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth [even in the baptised] against the spirit: and the spirit against the flesh. For these are contrary one to another; so that you do not the things that you would (!). But if you are led by the spirit you are not under the law." One would say that the change consists only in this—that this conflict in the baptised is no longer aggravated by the intervention of the Law, and especially that it no longer takes place between the flesh and the human spirit (that is to say, the soul—as a spiritual thing), but between the flesh and the divine spirit, the *pneuma*, or sanctifying grace. For St. Paul, however, the change is, in reality, radical, although limited for the present in its effects. So he writes: "Ourselves, also, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit: even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption of the sons of God, the redemption of our body . . . For we are saved by hope" (Rom. viii, 23, *seq.*).

THE PROGRAMME OF THE NEW LIFE.—Here our first task is to quote St. Paul's solemn affirmations with regard to the "good works" to which the new man is dedicated in God's name, and which constitute his actual life. So we read in Ephes. ii, 10: "For we are His workmanship, created [in baptism] in Christ Jesus in good works, which God hath prepared that we should walk in them." In Col. i, 9, *seq.:* "We . . . beg that you may be filled with the knowledge of (God's) will [the supreme rule of good works], in all wisdom and spiritual understanding [the work in active Christian life of supernatural discernment and prudence, illuminated by the fuller lights of faith and of the gifts], that you may walk worthy of God, in all things pleasing; being fruitful in every good work. . . ." "God's will" means in plain language what is expressed finely, but somewhat obscurely, in Ephes. ii, 10: ". . . which God hath prepared that we should walk in them." This phrase, however, seems to be more far-reaching, and to attribute to the divine will a more active function than that of a simple rule.

St. Paul often reverts to the necessity of good works for the baptised. See II Thess. i, 16; II Cor. ix, 8; I Tim. ii, 9, 10; v, 10; vi, 18; II Tim. ii, 21; Titus ii, 7; iii, 1, *seq.;* Heb. x, 24. It is his works, good or bad, which will constitute the matter of the judgment which Christ will pronounce upon each one at the last day. "For we must all be manifested before the judgment seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done, whether it be good or evil" (II Cor. v, 10). Cf. Rom. xiv, 10, *seq.*

Thus is made evident the entire agreement between St. Paul and St. James (ii, 14, *seq.*) with regard to the necessity for justification of the co-operation of faith and works. They are now speaking of the same thing, viz. of the second justification, before the judgment-seat of Christ, and not of the first justification, the work

of faith and baptism. That St. James is, as a matter of fact, speaking of the second justification, will be clearly seen by anyone who will take the trouble to observe that St. James is addressing Christians, for whom the first justification has already been accomplished.

The Christian life implies, according to St. Paul, a steady progress: "Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect: but I follow after, if I may by any means apprehend, wherein I am also apprehended by Jesus Christ. Brethren, I do not count myself to have apprehended. But one thing I do, forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forth myself to those that are before, I press towards the mark, to the prize of the supernal vocation of God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore, as many as are perfect, be thus minded: . . . Nevertheless, whereunto we are come, that we be of the same mind, let us also continue in the same rule" (Philip iii, 12, *seq.*). Cf. I Cor. x, 1, *seq.*

Christ's example and the imitation of it are one of the rules and one of the motives of this progress. Is not the new life the very life of Christ in the baptised? To this St. Paul often recurs, as in Philip. ii, 4, *seq.*: "Each one not considering the things that are his own, but those that are other men's. For let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:* but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man, and in habit found as a man. He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death: even to the death of the Cross." And in Ephes. v, 1—where God, Whose son the baptised man has become, is associated with Christ: "Be ye followers of God, as most dear children"—by mercy; an evident allusion to the saying of Jesus reported in Luke vi, 26—"And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath delivered

* Fr.: "*il ne s'attacha pas jalousement à l'égalité avec Dieu.*"

Himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness." Cf. Rom. xiii, 14; xv, 3, 7; I Cor. iv, 16; xi, 1; II Cor. iii, 18; Gal. iv, 9; Ephes. v, 25, etc.

We cannot here set out in detail the dispositions and actions which, according to St. Paul, actually make up the new psychology and life. He gives a suggestive hint of them in his enumeration of the fruits of the spirit in contrast with the works of the flesh; Gal. v, 19, *seq.*: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury, idolatry, witchcrafts, enmities, contentions, emulations, wraths, quarrels, dissensions, sects, envies, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. Of the which I foretell you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God." (St. Paul is addressing his Christian flock, and he by no means considers them impeccable. Here we have exactly the notion of mortal sin.) "But the fruit of the spirit [on the other hand] is charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, goodness, longanimity, mildness, faith, modesty, continency, chastity."

Such is the magnificent morality which is the fruit of Pauline spirituality. Morality, be it noted, and not asceticism, with regard to which St. Paul observes a greater reserve, though he does not condemn it as such. (See Rom xiv; I Cor vii, 2-5.) When he finds it connected with reversions to Judaism (Gal. iv, 10; v, 1) or with a "philosophy" of a gnostic type, he severely reproves it. The saying which best expresses his mind on the matter (which is that of Jesus) is to be found in I Tim. iv, 8: "For bodily exercise* is profitable to little; but godliness is profitable to all things. . . ."

All the writers of the N.T. vie with one another in their insistence on the part played by "trial" in the life of

* Fr.: "*l'ascèse*."

the Christian: Rom. v, 4; James i, 3; I Pet. i, 7, etc. St. Paul expresses it in the following terms, which interpret their common mind on the subject and that of their Master: "Knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience trial, and trial hope. And hope confoundeth not; because the charity of God [for us] is poured forth in our hearts [as sanctifying grace, and love for God] by the Holy Ghost, Who is given to us" (Rom. v, 3, *seq.*).

A FEW SPECIAL RULES.—What we know as social morality begins to take substance and distinct form in St. Paul's Epistles. He lays down the rules of conduct towards those to whom hierarchical authority in the Church is committed, especially in I and II Tim., and Titus; towards those who are endowed with charismata, Rom. xii; I Cor. xii-xiv. He gives rules for married people, Ephes. v, 22, *seq.;* Col. iii, 18; for parents and children, Ephes. vi, 1, *seq.;* Col. iii, 20.; for masters and servants, Ephes. vi, 5, *seq.;* Col. iii, 22, *seq.;* I Tim, vi, i, *seq.;* for widows, I Tim. v, 3, *seq.*, etc. He expounds their particular duties. To all he recommends work and orderly behaviour, I Thess. iv, 11, *seq.;* II Thess. iii, 6, *seq.* Swayed by various considerations, he prescribes this rule: that every man abide in the state in which the call of God finds him (I Cor. vii, 24).

St. Paul recurs on several occasions to the subject of submission to the authorities in the temporal order (Rom. xiii; Titus iii, 1; I Tim. ii, 1, *seq.;* and cf. I Pet. ii, 11, *seq.*). However, he does not approve of the saints taking any disputes among themselves (which ought not to be) before the pagan magistrates (I Cor. vi, 1-11). He shows himself much concerned in every respect to see that the brethren should make a good impression upon the pagans. In all their relations with these they must behave honestly, charitably,

worthily, wisely, prudently (I Thess. iv, 11; Rom. xii, 17; I Cor. xiv, 23; Col. iv, 5, *seq.;* I Tim. iii, 7, etc.). Cf. I Pet. ii, 11, *seq.* But he will not have too close intimacies, nor religious intercourse (I Cor. viii; x, 14, *seq.*; II Cor. vi, 14, *seq.;* etc.).

St. Paul advises celibacy, for that makes it possible to care for nothing but to please the Lord. At the same time he appreciates the religious value of marriage and of maternity. Consecrated as it is by its symbolical relation to the union of Christ with the Church, Christian marriage is indissoluble. In the married state the wife enjoys the same rights as her husband, in spite of her natural subordination to the man (I Cor. vii; xi, 1, *seq.;* Ephes. v, 29, *seq.;* I Tim. v, 14, *seq.;* ii, 14; iv, 3).

CHAPTER IV

CHRISTIAN HOPE

SUMMARY: I.—*The object of Christian hope.* II.—*The fulfilment of Christian hope.* III.—*The Reign of Christ.*

I.—THE OBJECT OF CHRISTIAN HOPE

IT is "glory." "Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. By whom also we have access through faith into this grace, wherein we stand, and glory in the hope of the glory of the sons of God"* (Rom. v, 1, 2). In Rom. viii, 17, *seq.*, the object of Christian hope is given as "the revelation of the sons of God," for which all nature is waiting (cf. I John iii, 2); "the liberty of the glory of the children of God"; "the redemption of our body"; "salvation."

Glory: this is pre-eminently the Pauline formula for the definition of the object of our hope. Cf. I Thess. ii, 12; II Thess. ii, 13; II Cor. iv, 17; Col. i, 27; iii, 4; II Tim. i, 10, etc. So, too, we have in I Pet. v, 4: "And when the prince of pastors shall appear, you shall receive a never-fading crown of glory." This image of the crown is found also in II Tim. iv, 8, and I Cor. ix, 25, and the complementary idea of reigning in Rom. v, 17; I Cor. iv, 8; II Tim. ii, 12, and in the Apocalypse, *passim.*

Heaven—the heavenly Kingdom—is the place where the Christian will enjoy this glory: "The Lord hath

* Fr.: *la gloire de Dieu.*

delivered me from every evil work: and will preserve me unto His heavenly kingdom"* (II Tim. iv, 18). Is it not in heaven that the Christian has even now his *politeuma*—a technical term which signifies the status, the rights, the activity, of a citizen? (Philip. iii, 20).

To the life of the glorified Christian in the heavenly Kingdom we have this fuller reference in I Cor. xiii, 12: "We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know [God] even as I am known [by God]." This is obviously to be taken as referring to the (intellectual) vision of God face to face.

We find the same doctrine in I John iii, 2: "Dearly beloved, we are now the sons of God; and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. We know that when He shall appear we shall be like to Him, because we shall see Him as He is." And this will be the consummation of a process which, normally, goes on throughout this present life: "But we all, beholding the glory of the Lord [Jesus Christ] with open face [an allusion to Moses' veil which covers the eyes of the Jews], are transformed in the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord" (II Cor. iii, 18).

We have mentioned, without further consideration, a formula in which St. Paul takes a very special interest, although it expresses what is in itself but a secondary object of Christian hope. We mean "the redemption of our body," which is wrought through the resurrection. "And if Christ be in you," writes St. Paul (Rom. viii, 10, 11), "the body indeed is dead [devoted to death] because of sin, but the spirit liveth because of justification. And if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of His Spirit that dwelleth in you." When he defends

* Fr.: "will deliver . . . will save me in . . ." (Trans).

against the Corinthians this idea of the resurrection of the body—repugnant to their Greek mentality—the Apostle explains that as there is a "psychic" ("natural") body, of which Adam is the prototype, so there is a "pneumatic" ("spiritual") body, of which the risen Christ is the exemplar, and this is characterised by incorruptibility, glory, and power (I Cor. xv, 42-49). For "flesh and blood cannot possess the [heavenly] Kingdom of God" (I Cor. xv, 50). St. Paul is upholding the resurrection of the body, in its proper sense, and as an object of hope, against certain Asiatic innovators who declare that it has already taken place (II Tim. ii, 18).

II.—The Fulfilment of Christian Hope

This fulfilment is bound up with the manifestation of Christ, and this is itself also the object of Christian hope. "You turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God. And to wait for [the coming of] His Son from heaven (Whom He raised up from the dead), Jesus, Who hath delivered us from the wrath to come" (I Thess. i, 9, 10.) "Waiting for the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Cor. i, 7). Cf. Philip. iii, 20; Titus ii, 13; Heb. ix, 28.

The external accompaniments of this apocalypse or parousia are described in I Thess. iii, 13: "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints," and especially in I Thess. iv, 13-v, 11. Again, we read in II Thess. i, 7: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with the angels of His power: in a flame of fire. . . ." See also II Thess. ii, 1-12.

Then at the parousia will take place the resurrection of "the dead who are in Christ," and the change of those of His disciples whom it shall find living (I Thess. iv, 16, *seq.*; I Cor. xv, 52). It might seem, according to these texts, confirmed by I Cor. xv, 23, Philip. iii, 11, that

only "they that are of Christ" will rise again or will be changed. That, however, is not so. The resurrection will be general, as will the judgment which will follow it: "I charge thee before God and Jesus Christ, Who shall judge the living and the dead, by His coming, and His Kingdom." (II Tim. iv, 1. Cf. Heb. ix, 27; I Pet. iv, 5.)

There is, indeed, no doubt that the Apostle's thought on this subject conforms with the teaching of Jesus. Cf. Acts xvii, 18, *seq.* As, however, he is writing to Christians, it is their destiny that he has in mind. Moreover, the resurrection of which he is speaking is the resurrection in glory, which will not be the lot of all. If the reading of the Vulgate in Cor. xv, 51—"We shall all indeed rise again; but we shall not all be changed"—is doubtful as regards the text, it none the less expresses correctly St. Paul's thought as to the general resurrection of the dead.

We have already spoken above of the last judgment and of the matter of it—good or bad works. The Judge will be Christ; but with Him Christians will judge "the world," and "angels" (I Cor. vi, 2, *seq.*) Without any allusion to this judgment, asserted elsewhere, the description of the parousia, given in I Thess. iv, 14, *seq.*, ends thus: "Then we who are alive, who are left, shall be taken up together with them [the dead Christians who have risen first] in the clouds [possibly an allusion to Jesus' Ascension] to meet Christ, into the air, and so shall we be always with the Lord."

Meanwhile, we have brought to our notice, in II Cor. v, 1, *seq.*, another form of Christian hope, which, without any contradiction of what has gone before, comes in opportunely to determine it more exactly. So far, indeed, we might well have thought that St. Paul conceived the state of the "saints" who die before the parousia to be such as the condition of the dead is represented to be in the O.T. But this is not so; it is

possible to be with Christ before the parousia. So we read in the passage indicated: "For we know, if our earthly house of this habitation [clearly, our present body] be dissolved, that we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in heaven [this must be the heavenly body]. For in this also we groan, desiring to be clothed upon with our habitation from heaven [that is to say, without having to put off previously, by death, our present habitation, our earthly body]. Yet so that we be found [at the parousia] clothed, not naked [i.e. living]. For we also who are in this tabernacle do groan, being burthened: because we would not be unclothed [of our earthly body, by death] but clothed upon [with the heavenly body], that that which is mortal may be swallowed up by life [through that transformation which will be experienced by the saints whom the parousia will find living]. Now he that maketh us for this very thing is God, Who hath given us the pledge of the Spirit. [Here there is a sudden change in the thought.] Therefore having always confidence, knowing that while we are in the body we are absent from the Lord. (For we walk by faith and not by sight.) But we are confident and have a good will to be absent rather from the body [i.e. to die] and to be present with the Lord [without waiting for the parousia]."

Observe the individual character of this hope as contrasted with the collective character of that which we noticed first. This reappears still more clearly in Philip. i, 23: "[I have] a desire to be dissolved [from this life] and to be with Christ, a thing by far the better." And again, in II Tim. iv, 18: "The Lord hath delivered* me from every evil work, and will preserve me [by a timely death] unto His heavenly Kingdom."

In II Tim. iv, 8, however, we have what looks like a reversion to the collective hope: "As to the rest, there

* Fr.: "will deliver . . . " See above, p. 130. (Trans.)

is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just judge, will render to me in that day [of the parousia]." Or, rather, we catch a glimpse of this idea—that blessed as may be the confidence of him who dies before the parousia of a personal and immediate meeting with Christ, yet the hope of the parousia and of the glories that follow it is still capital.

III.—The Reign of Christ

St. Paul, as did the whole early Community, lived in expectation of the parousia. In their eyes the parousia seemed to the "saints" very much as death seems to us; and far from being to them a cause of dismay, it was their hope and their joy. How much more was this the case with the Apostle, who, himself too, considered it as almost within sight. There were, moreover, some sayings of Christ which seemed to foster this state of mind.

Nevertheless, it was known from the teaching of Jesus, and certainly by St. Paul, that the date of the parousia was known to nobody, and that, as it was ordained to come unexpectedly, like a thief, it was impossible to make any definite conjecture as to the time when it would take place. There was in St. Paul's mind, as in the minds of his contemporaries, as it were a continual conflict between the lively expectation of the parousia and the consciousness of complete ignorance of its real date. The Pauline Epistles witness, by the diversity of the passages which deal with the subject, to this division of mind in St. Paul and all the Christians of his day. Hence, from time to time, extreme movements would arise of opposite tendencies, either favouring the imminence of the parousia (I and II Thess.), or denying the hope of any parousia at all (II Tim. ii, 18). St. Paul set to work energetically to right matters; for instance,

in II Thess. ii, where he puts aside the notion that the parousia is imminent, by reason of certain definite considerations, the exact significance of which we cannot grasp.

The parousia is not imminent, but near. But, again, what in his mind is this nearness? As we have just seen his mind seemingly divided between a lively expectation and a no less lively sense of his ignorance, so now his thought presents itself to us as wavering, with regard to the future, between two contrary tendencies. From the beginning of his career to the end of it, in different ways, he brings out the proximity of the parousia (I Cor. i, 7; vii, 31; xv, 52; Rom. xiii, 12; Philip. iv, 6; I Tim. vi, 14; Titus ii, 13. Cf. I Pet. i, 5). And at the same time he seems to contemplate an unlimited development of the Christian apostolate and of the life of the Church (Rom. xi, 1; I Cor. xv, 24, *seq.;* Ephes. iii, 21; I Tim. ii, 1, *seq.*, etc.).

How can we avoid the idea that this notion of proximity hides some mystery? Has this nearness any relation to time and the human order? Should it not rather be referred to the divine chronology, of which St. Peter says so calmly—and precisely when speaking of the parousia— "One day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day"? (II Pet. iii, 8). There can be no doubt about it. The proximity of the parousia must be interpreted in terms, not of earthly chronology, but of the divine project, of which, taken as a whole, it constitutes the final act near at hand. But near in this sense—that there is nothing else of the sort between it and the present state of things, of the Christ Who has come already.*

This present state St. Paul calls the Reign of Christ, and—so far does it define His office and His work in what is proper to them—the true, though not the only,

* R. P. Allo, *Saint Jean, l'Apocalypse.* Paris, 1921. pp. civ, *seq.*

Kingship of Christ. I Cor. xv, 24, *seq.:* "Afterwards the end, when He shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God and the Father, when He shall have brought to naught all principality and power and virtue. For He must reign [completing His own work of redemption] *until He hath put all His enemies under His feet.* And the enemy, death, shall be destroyed last [by the final resurrection]. *For He* [God] *hath put all things under His feet* [Ps. cix, 1]. And whereas He saith, *All things are put under Him*, undoubtedly He [God] is excepted Who put all things under Him. And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then the Son also Himself shall be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all."

This Kingship of Christ evidently implies a Kingdom —a Realm—which is the Church. Now we have seen that Christ is the Head of the Church, which itself is His body. From Ephes. v, 22, we learn that Christ is the Church's Bridegroom. Here He is set before us as its King, or, to use St. Paul's word, its Lord. Better still —He is "the Lord." To these offices of the glorified Christ—all of which have relation to His Church—the Epistle to the Hebrews adds that of High Priest. And behind all these, as their source, stands in the mind of St. Paul the fundamental office of Redeemer, itself bound up with the mysterious personality of Christ, the Son of God made Man.

We shall have to return to this later on. For the present we must be content with recalling the manifold relations of the glorified Christ with the Church implied in these titles of Head, High Priest and Lord (King), without undertaking any detailed analysis, which, moreover, would carry us outside the limits of definitely Pauline thought. Through the sacraments, in worship—of which the Eucharist, the memorial of the Passion, is manifestly the core—through its organisation, both

hierarchical and charismatic, He exercises on and in the Church, or for her welfare, a manifold activity which is His Kingship in action.

The destinies of this Kingship and of this Kingdom evidently represented as being worked out through long ages, constitute the whole subject of St. John's visions and of his Apocalypse.

However, after the present Reign of Christ, which is a Reign of warfare and His true Reign as Redeemer, will come His Kingship in glory as Son of God incarnate, an eternal Kingship, in the heavens (II Tim. iv, 1, 18, etc.).

PART III

THE PERSONALITY OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

THE LORD

SUMMARY: I.—*Lord, as a title given to Jesus during His life on earth.* II.—*Lord, as a title of the Risen Christ in the Palestinian communities.* III.—*Lord, as a title of the Risen Christ in St. Paul's writings.*

I.—LORD, AS A TITLE GIVEN TO JESUS DURING HIS LIFE ON EARTH

ST. JOHN, more than any other writer of the N.T., has thrown light upon the mystery of the personality of Jesus. And this he has done to a great extent especially by reporting portions of Jesus' teaching which neither the primitive oral teaching nor the Synoptics (who founded their writings upon it) have handed down to us. This fresh contribution by the fourth Gospel to our knowledge of the words and historical doings of Jesus is to be explained by the character of its author, John, the son of Zebedee, "the disciple whom Jesus loved"; by the particular end that he had in view when he wrote his invaluable work, towards the end of the first century; and, lastly, by the loftiness of the author's spiritual attainment which enabled him to absorb and his readers to grasp this final revelation of Jesus through him—a revelation which had been not very well and but slowly understood. St. John, however, does but take

up again and complete the work of the Synoptics and of St. Paul, to whom we owe elucidations of the personality of Jesus of great importance; and these we must first of all bring out and classify.

When treating, in Part I, of Jesus as the Founder of the Kingdom of God, we purposely left aside this title, which, nevertheless, belongs to Him by virtue of His Messiaship. That we thus passed it by, as the arrangement of this exposition seemed to require, does not in the least imply that we adhere to the well-known thesis of W. Bousset. He maintains that this title, of religious origin, directly signifying divinity, could not have been conferred on Jesus until after His Resurrection, and then by the earliest Hellenistic communities, who had been familiarized with it through the worship of the emperors and the phraseology of the mysteries.

This will not do at all; the matter is much less simple than that. Let us look at the facts.

And first we will turn to St. Mark. In his Gospel the title of Lord is given to Jesus only three times: (1) By the Canaanitish woman, Mark vii, 28: "Yea, Lord, for the whelps also eat under the table of the crumbs of the children." Here perhaps the title is given merely out of courtesy.

(2) We meet with it again on the lips of Jesus Himself, in Mark xi, 3: "Say ye that the Lord hath need of him"—viz. the colt. The context is Messianic and the title must be so too—the Lord, (Maran, Kyrios) is, in the usual Court language of Syro-Greek royalties, the reigning King. Here it signifies the Messianic King. None in Jesus' company could make any mistake about that.

(3) A third time, in Mark xii, 35, Jesus again applies this title to Himself by implication: "How do the scribes say that Christ [the Messias] is the Son of David? For David himself saith by the Holy Ghost: The Lord [Jahve] said to my Lord [Adonai, the Messias]:

Sit on my right hand until I make thy* enemies thy footstool." What Jesus would have His hearers to understand is that if the Messias is the Son of David—which He does not mean to question—He is also something more and greater than that. Otherwise at least David, His father, would not have called Him "My Lord." Nevertheless, Lord is here still the kingly title of the Messias, but with the added connotation of His divinity.

Thus we have in Mark the paradigm, as it were, of the various meanings of the word Lord: an expression of courtesy; the title proper to the Messianic King; a title of the Messias connoting also His divinity. On the other hand, it will be noted that it appears but rarely. Undoubtedly it is one of the features by which is manifested the historical realism of Mark.

In Matthew and Luke, where the title of Lord applied to Jesus is more frequently met with, it seems especially to belong to the terminology of eschatology. Such is the case in Matt. vii, 21, *seq.;* xxv, 11, 20, *seq.* 27, *seq.* It is still the pre-eminent title of the Messias, His designation as the reigning King, and now as such in the sovereign exercise of His royal (eschatological) authority. It is, nevertheless, found in the narrative passages, with not very clearly defined meanings—as an expression of courtesy, or a Messianic appellation. It must have the latter import when on the lips of the Jews it is associated with the Messianic title of Son of David, as in Matt. ix, 27; xv, 22, *seq.;* xx, 30; and when so used sometimes by the disciples: Matt. xvi, 22; xvii, 4. Luke is peculiar in that he himself uses this term, "the Lord," to indicate Jesus. No doubt, when he does so he takes it in the later Christian sense, which we shall have to state later. Cf. Mark i, 1.

Wherever, then, in the synoptic sayings and narratives we find this title of Lord applied to Jesus with a connotation other than that of an expression of high and

* Fr.: *My.*

reverent courtesy, it has its proper significance of King, and it indicates Him as the reigning Messianic King. Mark, however, and the two other Synoptics as well, when reporting a speech of Jesus to the Scribes (and a somewhat enigmatic one), introduces it with a special and peculiarly richer significance, viz., as the royal title of the Messias as before, but with a hinted implication of His divinity.

II.—Lord, as a Title of the Risen Christ in the Palestinian Communities

In his accounts of events after the Resurrection, St. Mark, hitherto so reserved, suddenly changes his style. "And the Lord Jesus, after He had spoken to them, was taken up. . . . But they going forth, preached everywhere, the Lord working withal" (Mark xvi, 19, 20). Does this simply mean that the instructions as to the Messianic secret are no longer operative, or is there some other reason? Let us look at the Acts.

Let us hear what Peter has to say—Peter who is pre-eminently the witness to the thought of the Twelve after the Resurrection, and to that of the primitive Church: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know most certainly that God hath made both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus, Whom you have crucified" (Acts ii, 36). Cf. i, 21; v, 31; ix, 33, *seq.;* x, 36, *seq.;* xi, 17. Lord and Christ—here we have the association of the two terms. Lord, then, expresses clearly the royal character of the Messias; it is pre-eminently the title of the Messianic King. As in the language of the etiquette of the Syrian and Greek courts, "the Lord," "our Lord," is the designation proper to the reigning King, "God has made [Him] both Lord and Christ" by His Resurrection and exaltation into heaven. Then He was not so till then? Yes; but henceforth He is so in quite a new way. Now

He reigns in the full exercise of His Messianic sovereignty as before He did not do, in the same fulness, though at the same time He was already the Messianic King. Whence the suddenly-revealed expectation of the disciples: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?" (Acts i, 6). That is, not exactly the Kingdom of Israel, but the Kingship of God in Israel, such as the Messianic outpouring of the Holy Spirit was to bear witness to.

We are still, then, on strictly Messianic ground. Jesus is presented to us as the Messias, as the Messianic King, in a word, as the Lord, and in the full and fresh display of His Royalty and Kingship in all their functions. He is really, and in the fullest sense, the King in His majesty. There is nothing which suggests His divinity. Peter says flatly: "God hath *made* both Lord and Christ." From these Palestinian circles doubtless derives the Aramean form of address and of prayer, Maran-atha—Come, Lord—which is Messianic and was to spread even among the Hellenistic communities (I Cor. xvi, 22; Didache, x).

From the very beginning we find the Palestinian community offering its corporate prayer to Jesus as Lord: "Thou, Lord, Who knowest the hearts" (Acts i, 24). Stephen does the same, Acts vii, 59. Here, however, the word is used in a derived sense. The application to Jesus of the title of Lord did not begin in worship or prayer; it is the result and supreme expression of faith in His Messiahship.

Are we to add that it witnesses directly to faith in Jesus' divinity? There are reasons for thinking so. Attributes and functions which in the O.T. are referred only to Jahve (the Lord), are from the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles, transferred to Jesus (the Lord) (Acts i, 24; ii, 21, 47; vii, 59, *seq.*). But (we may ask) does this transference signify that the title of Lord applied to

Jesus is, not the pre-eminent designation of the Messias, but a directly divine appellation, as it were, the very name of God?

Let us put this question aside for the moment without answering it, and pursue our enquiry.

III.—Lord, as a Title of the Risen Christ in St. Paul's Writings

The Pauline Jesus is Jesus risen and glorified. We will not waste time in proving that St. Paul regards Him as the Messias. In the Pauline Epistles Christ (Messias) is hardly any longer a title of Jesus—Jesus the Christ; it becomes a part of His name—Jesus Christ; or His name itself—Christ.

For St. Paul the true title of Jesus is "the Lord." And, clearly, this term, "the Lord," is in his mind the royal title which befits Jesus, Who is the Messianic King—the Messias actually and gloriously reigning.

Quite in accordance with propriety are the phrases, "the Lord (or "our Lord") Jesus Christ," and "Jesus Christ our Lord," by which St. Paul delights to designate Jesus. For him they are the very expression of the Christian faith (Rom. x, 9; I Cor. xii, 3; II Cor. iv, 5). While God is the proper designation of the Father, Lord is the appellation reserved for Jesus Christ (I Cor. viii, 6). As with the word Christ, so Lord, even, tends to become attached to him as if it were a proper name.

This last feature brings us back to the question which we mentioned, but left unanswered, with regard to the Acts. So far we felt very decidedly that we were concerned with Jesus' Messiahship, and that this official title, Lord, signified the fulness of His Messianic royalty, of which Jesus became possessed by His Resurrection. But the change of Lord into a proper name cannot fail to remind us that "the Lord," or "Lord," is, in the

Septuagint, the name of Jahve Himself. The question, then, that we have to solve is whether we are concerned with the kingly title of the Messias or a divine name.

There are two passages in the Epistles, in particular, which serve to clear up this doubt—Rom i, 3, *seq.*, and Philip. ii, 5, *seq.* This last passage is particularly clear. "For let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, Who being in the form [or nature] of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God [did not jealously cling to His divine condition]:* But emptied Himself [in the sphere of this equality with God], taking the form [the state and nature] of a servant, being made in the likeness of men,† and in habit found as a man. He humbled himself [by reason of human nature, which He had taken], becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross. For which cause God also hath exalted Him [in His human nature, through His glorious Resurrection], and hath given Him [in His human nature] a name which is above all names [that of Lord, by which God Himself is designated]. That in the name of Jesus every knee should bow of those that are in heaven, on earth and under the earth: and that every tongue should confess that the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father."‡

We have spoken of this passage as being particularly clear. We shall probably be considered very optimistic. The truth is that it is at once both clear and complicated. It is clear in that we observe that the title of Lord has been conferred by God the Father on His Incarnate Son in return for His self-emptying (the Incarnation) and

* See below. † See below.

‡ The French has: ". . . did not cling jealously to equality with God [to His divine condition]."

"(. . . likeness of men). And being found in habit as a man, He humbled Himself. . . ."

". . . that every tongue should confess to the glory of God that Jesus Christ is Lord."

cf. (Anglican) R.V. [Trans.]

His obedience (the death on the Cross). It was conferred on His Son in the human nature which He took—in that human nature according to which, also, He is the Messias. So, then, Lord and Messias are seen to be strictly and directly names of the Man Jesus. But it is also clear —and this is of great importance—that in Jesus the human nature is united to the divine nature by a personal union—that it is the human nature of the Son of God. The title of Lord, if it indicates the Son of God in His human nature, none the less does designate in fact the person who is Son of God.

Here we come back to the remark made with reference to the question propounded by Jesus to the Scribes. Lord, a title of the Messianic King, belongs to Jesus according to His humanity, but connotes His divinity.

This also holds good with rare exceptions, as we shall soon discover, for His other titles—for those of Messias, Judge, Priest, Head, Mediator. If they connote the divinity to which it is united in His person, it is to His humanity that they apply directly. So with reference to His title and office of Judge, we read that they have been conferred on Jesus because He is the Son of Man (John v, 27). Or, again, with reference to the office of Priest, we find: "For every high-priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God. . . ." (Heb. v, 1; Cf. iv, 15.) Once more, with reference to the title of Mediator, St. Paul writes, in I Tim. ii, 5: "For there is . . . one mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus." As regards Christ as Head of the Church, cf. Ephes. i, 10, 22.

Finally, the remark (recalled above) applies with special force to that office of Saviour, or Redeemer, which according to St. Paul takes precedence of, and is the condition of, all the others, at least in this sense, that it is the motive of the Incarnation itself. See I Tim. ii, 5, 6; Ephes. i, 7, *seq.*, etc. This also relates directly to

the Incarnate Son, Jesus, according to His humanity, but connoting, too, His divinity.

There is, however, one special difficulty in the word Lord. Has it not become, in biblical usage, a substitute for the name Jahve—the name of God Himself? In itself it is no less a title than a true name. And in so far as it has, in fact, become a name, still it is not a name implying nature, but a name implying relation. In itself it does not express the divine nature, and even custom has not conferred upon it any other prerogative than that of signifying the sovereignty of the divine nature. In so far as this sovereignty can be communicated, so far also may the term which indicates it. Both are thus attached in a unique degree and a unique sense to the humanity of the Son of God.

St. Paul—as does St. Peter—connects this Lordship of Jesus Christ with His Resurrection, which confirms the view that this Lordship is attributed to His humanity, and is not a Lordship which is immediately and intrinsically divine. So, for example, he says or supposes in Rom. x, 9, and Ephes. i, 19, *seq.* In the latter passage we read: ". . . according to the operation of the might of His [God's] power, which He wrought in Christ, raising Him up from the dead, and setting Him on His right hand in the heavenly places. Above all principality and power and virtue and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come. And He hath subjected all things under His feet." And this passage recalls how Jesus Himself had spoken of the Son of Man seated at the right hand of God.

In Rom. x, 9, the Apostle writes: "For if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in thy heart that God hath raised Him up from the dead, thou shalt be saved," and thus brings out how closely bound up with one another and, as it were, equivalent, are the enthronement of Jesus as Lord and the Resurrection.

Rom. i, 3, *seq.*, takes us back to Philip. ii, 6, *seq.*: "Paul . . . separated unto the Gospel of God . . . concerning His Son, Who was made to Him of the seed of David according to the flesh, and given possession, according to the spirit of holiness [which is here His divine nature] by the resurrection, of the power [or Lordship] which befits Him as the Son of God, that is, Jesus Christ, our Lord."* This is a synthesis, though expressed in a complicated form, of all that has gone before. We find in the one person of the Son of God the meeting of His two natures, the divine and human. We find the power, or Lordship, in its full extent, conferred on His humanity, but inasmuch as the humanity is united to the divinity in the person of the Son of God. Lastly, this elevation of the humanity of the Son to the dignity of Lord, that is to say, to the full exercise of His Messianic royalty, is the consequence of the Resurrection.

Well, then, this Lordship is not just that of God, but the full Messianic Lordship; it is not the Lordship of the Son of God as such, but the Lordship of the Son of God as incarnate. It is not the Lordship of God (and Jesus is God), but the Lordship of the Man-God, which He is too. It is a formal title which designates the reigning King, applied to the Messianic King, Whose reign in glory has been inaugurated by the Resurrection. This is the sense in which "Lord" is used in the edited passages of the Synoptics, in the Acts, and in the Epistles of St. Paul, of St. James, of St. Jude, and of St. Peter. In the speeches (logia) and narrative passages in the Synoptics it expresses simply the Messianic Royalty of Jesus, without any positive allusion to His divinity, except in Mark xii, 35, and the parallel passages.

* So in the text. The Rheims Version has: ". . . the flesh, Who was predestinated the Son of God in power according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead." (Trans).

CHAPTER II

THE SON OF GOD

SUMMARY: I.—*The Son of God, in the Synoptics.* II.—*The Son of God, in St. Paul.*

I.—THE SON OF GOD, IN THE SYNOPTICS

NEITHER in the canonical writings of the O.T., nor in later Jewish literature do we find the formula "Son of God" as a distinctly Messianic title. There is at most a suggestion of it in Ps. ii, 7, 8: "The Lord hath said to me: Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of Me, and I will give Thee the Gentiles for Thy inheritance." The reference is to the Messianic King, and God calls Him His Son. But God gives this same name to others—to Israel, to Cyrus, etc. In the Apocalypse of Esdras, in vii, 28, *seq.* (probably), and in xiii, 32, 37, 52 (certainly), God speaks of the Messias as "My Son." But this is all. The exact formula, "Son of God," to indicate the Messias, is found nowhere.

It is relatively frequent in the Synoptics, where its exact significance—whether Messianic or strictly divine —often remains uncertain.

When the Father thus speaks of Jesus, there is no reason why we should not take the expression in its proper sense, as signifying a natural sonship. This is so in the case of the theophany at the baptism of Jesus (Mark i, 10; Matt. iii, 17; Luke iii, 22). It is so, too, at the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii, 5; Luke ix, 35 and— where there is a slight variation of form—Mark ix, 6).

The repetition at the Transfiguration of the formula used at the baptism should suffice for the rejection of the critical hypothesis according to which Jesus became the Son of God on the banks of the Jordan, by the descent of the Holy Spirit.

The claim of a natural sonship and of a true community of nature with God is made by Jesus Himself in the parable of The Wicked Husbandmen (Matt. xxi, 33, *seq.;* Mark xii, 1, *seq.;* Luke xx, 9, *seq.*). The same claim is shown in His affirmative reply to the High Priest's question, in Luke xxii, 70; cf. Matt. xxvi, 64, and Mark xiv, 61. Doubtless, too, in Mark xiii, 32: "But of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father."

We may equally well believe that St. Peter's confession in Matt. xvi, 16—"Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God"—implies more than the merely Messianic notion of a divine Sonship, privileged, no doubt, but only moral.

In the other passages of the Synoptics in which "Son of God" appears, the meaning is uncertain. It seems to indicate especially a lively impression of the grandeur and mysteriousness of Jesus. It would seem to be so used by St. Peter in his exclamation reported in Mark iii, 12, and in the occasional utterances of Satan (in the Temptation) and the demons. Sometimes we find the title of Christ used instead of it.

On the other hand, it is quite evident that in the opening sentence of St. Mark's Gospel (i, 1)—"The beginning of the Gospel of [i.e. which has as its subject] Jesus Christ the Son of God"—"Son of God" is to be taken in the sense of the later belief, that of a true and natural sonship.

Of inestimable value is the saying reported in Matt. xi, 25-30: "I confess to Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to little ones.

Yea, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight. All things are delivered to Me by My Father. And no one knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither doth anyone know the Father, but the Son and he to whom it shall please the Son to reveal Him." Here the Father and the Son are placed upon the same plane and are, as it were, strictly proportioned to one another; the Son is God equally with the Father. One would take it to be a Johannine saying: e.g. John x, 15; cf.—though the context is different—Luke x, 21, *seq.*

The words of Jesus which we read in Matt. xviii, 20, though not of so great significance, are not without interest: "For where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." In reference to this, Père Lagrange recalls the utterance of Rabbi Chananiah: "Where two are seated together, intent upon the Torah, glory (Jahveh) is in the midst of them." The parallel between the presence of Jesus and the presence of Jahveh is suggestive.

The earlier chapters of the Acts contain only once the title Son of God applied to Jesus; this is in Acts viii, 37, and its authenticity is doubtful.

II.—The Son of God, in St. Paul

There can be no possible doubt as to the sense of this appellation when we find St. Paul applying it to Christ considered as pre-existing. For instance, we read in Rom. viii, 3: "God sending His own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh. . . ." The Son is the Son before His sending; it is, indeed, the statement of the mystery of the Incarnation. We have the same thing, and quite explicitly, in the passage we have already considered—Philip. ii, 6, *seq.*—and we have no fuller statement of the Incarnation of the true and eternal Son of God earlier than the Prologue of St. John's Gospel. The intro-

duction to the Epistle to the Romans (i, 1, *seq.*), which we have already quoted, is especially valuable as marking the co-existence in the one Person of the Incarnate Son of the human nature and of the divine (spirit of holiness).

Without this distinction between the Son pre-existing in the divine nature and the Son incarnate, in Whose one personality the human nature and the divine nature co-exist, Col. i, 13, *seq.*, would be quite unintelligible: "[God] hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of His love: in Whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins: Who [the Son pre-existing] is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature. For in Him were all things created in heaven, and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominations, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him and in Him: and He is before all, and by Him all things consist. And He [the Son incarnate and in His human nature] is the Head of the body, the Church, Who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead: that in all things He may hold the primacy [in the sphere of salvation]: because in Him [in the Man Jesus, Who is, in reality, the pre-existing Son incarnate] it hath well pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell [of the divinity or, perhaps, of grace, as in John i, 16]: and through Him to reconcile all things to Himself, making peace through the blood of His cross [the Redemption—the motive of the Incarnation], both as to the things on earth and the things that are in heaven." Cf. Col. ii, 9: "For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporeally."

The subject is worked out on parallel lines in Heb. i, 1, *seq.*, with the same imperceptible passage from the Son pre-existing to the Son incarnate, which is explainable by the identity of the person—the divine Person of the true Son of God: "God, Who at sundry times and

in divers manners spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all, in these days hath spoken to us by His Son, Whom He hath appointed heir of all things [the Son incarnate], by Whom also He made the world [the Son pre-existing]. Who [i.e. this Son] being the brightness of His glory and the figure of His substance, and upholding all things by the word of His power [in His divine nature], making purgation of sins, sitteth on the right hand of the majesty on high [as Son incarnate]." And the passage goes on to extol the superiority to the angels and to Moses of the Incarnate Son, sometimes by reason of His divine nature—"Thou in the beginning, O Lord, didst found the earth," etc.—and sometimes in His human nature—"Thy throne, O God [O Elohim, taken in the wide sense], is for ever and ever," etc.

We must take as speaking of the Son incarnate—the Son in His human nature—the fine passage in Ephes. i, 3, *seq.*: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath blessed us with spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ. As He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world [in the divine decree which constituted Him as our Redeemer] that we should be holy and unspotted in His sight in charity. Who hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ unto Himself; according to the purpose of His will: Unto the praise of the glory of His grace, in which He hath graced us in His beloved Son." (Here we pass from the eternal sphere of predestination to the historical sphere of execution; but in each case we are concerned with the Son incarnate, the Redeemer.) "In Whom we have redemption [the first stage of the historical work of the Son incarnate] [bought] through His blood, the remission of sins according to the riches of His grace [sanctifying grace—the second stage of the historical work of the Son

incarnate]. Which hath super-abounded in us in all wisdom and prudence. That He might make known unto us the mystery of His will [in the Gospel] according to His good pleasure, which He hath purposed in Him [in predestination]. In the dispensation of the fulness of times [now inaugurated], to re-establish all things in Christ* that are in heaven and on earth in Him." (And by this the Incarnate Son is revealed as the acme and end of all creation.)

Is it not, also, of the Son incarnate and in His human nature, in which reside the fulness of grace and the power of sanctification (cf. in particular Col. ii, 18, *seq.*), that St. Paul writes in II Cor. iv, 3, *seq.*, that He is "the image of God"? And on this phrase he seems to comment when he writes of "the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus"—"the Lord" (v. 6).

In comparison with this rich Christology which brings out so clearly the meaning of the formula "Son of God" and sets the divinity of Jesus Christ in such marked relief, the following passages, though not without significance, are of but secondary interest.

Rom. ix, 5: ". . . . of whom [the Israelites] is Christ according to the flesh, Who is over all things, God blessed for ever."

Titus ii, 13: "Looking for the blessed hope and coming of the glory [the parousia] of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Lastly there is the famous and outspoken passage from the discourse to the Ephesian ancients, in Acts xx, 28: "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the Church of God [Jesus Christ], which He hath purchased with His own blood."

* Fr.: *tout rassembler sous une Tête unique, le Christ.*

CHAPTER III

CHRIST, IN SAINT JOHN

SUMMARY: I.—*Christ the Light.* II.—*Christ the Life.* III.—*The Father and the Son.* IV.—*The Word.*

I.—CHRIST THE LIGHT

LET us, for the moment, leave the Prologue aside. The special interest of the Fourth Gospel lies in the information it affords us on certain aspects of the history of Jesus as in His own words.

There stand out very markedly in the Johannine narrative these two attributes of Christ: the Light and the Life, especially the latter.

With reference to the ministry of Jesus at Capharnaum Matt. iv, 15, cites the prophecy in Isaias viii, 23, *seq.:* "Land of Zabulon and land of Nephthalim . . . the people that sat in darkness hath seen great light; and to them that sat in the region of the shadow of death light is sprung up." Here the light is the Gospel. On the other hand, with Simeon, Christ Himself is "a light to the revelation of the Gentiles" (Luke ii, 32).

St. Paul quotes a fragment of a hymn—perhaps a baptismal hymn—which runs as follows: "Rise thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead: and Christ shall enlighten thee" (Ephes. v, 14). And with this agrees Ephes. v, 8, where he writes: ". . . but now [you are] light in the Lord."

The first words in which Jesus speaks of Himself as the Light occur in John viii, 12: "Again therefore,

Jesus spoke to them [the Jews in the Temple], saying: I am the light of the world: he that followeth me, walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life." The connection between darkness and death, light and life, is classical in the scriptures. Nevertheless, here there seems to be a closer relation. However, what Jesus says here of Himself He says also of His disciples—"You are the light of the world" (Matt. v, 14). The Master's hearers may, perhaps, have thought that this was, in the prophetical scriptures, one of the prerogatives and functions of the Messias.

John ix, 5—"As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world"—adds nothing to the first-mentioned saying, nor do John xii, 35, 36: "Yet a little while the light is among you. Walk whilst you have the light, that the darkness overtake you not . . . Whilst you have the light, believe in the light, that you may be the children of light." It is sheer nonsense to suppose that there is any intention whatever of likening Christ-the-Light to the sun-gods of the surrounding paganism, or rather, of substituting him for them. Christ-the-Light means the same as Christ-the-Truth; cf. John xiv, 6, etc.

On two other occasions—but in passages in which Jesus' own words seem to be re-echoed, as it were, and developed by John—we meet with this theme of Christ-the-Light. St. John iii, 19, *seq.:* "And this is the judgment: because the light [considered as pre-existing] is come into the world [in Christ], and men loved darkness rather than the light." Here we receive the impression of a sudden rise from the sayings of Christ, which we have just noticed, of a concrete, or Messianic, character, to the theological atmosphere of the Prologue, where we find entirely similar expressions. This light which is come into the world is the Word, which was made flesh. This is true, also, and still more clearly, of John xii, 44

seq.: "He that believeth in Me doth not believe in Me, but in Him that sent Me. . . I am come, a light into the world, that whosoever believeth in Me may not remain in darkness."

II.—Christ the Life

This notion is familiar to St. Paul, who means life in the order of salvation and grace. "When Christ shall appear, who is your life, then you also shall appear with Him in glory" (Col. iii, 4. Cf. II Tim. i, 10.) In the Synoptics, life eternal is synonymous with the Kingdom of heaven (Matt. xix, 16, *seq.;* Mark ix, 44; Luke x, 25, etc.).

But in the Fourth Gospel life becomes one of the chief attributes of Christ. "And as Moses lifted up the [brazen] serpent in the desert, so must the Son of man be lifted up [on the Cross]: That whosoever believeth in Him may not perish, but may have life everlasting. For God so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son: that whosoever believeth in Him may not perish, but may have life everlasting" (John iii, 14, *seq.*).

This is teaching which St. Paul has made familiar to us—redemption brought by Christ, which accomplishes God's plan, and becomes for us the principle of life. Thus, we read in John iv, 13, *seq.*: "Whosoever drinketh of this water [of Jacob's well] shall thirst again: but he that shall drink of the water that I will give him [described above, in v. 10, as 'living water' and 'the gift of God'] shall not thirst for ever. But the water that I will give him [i.e. sanctifying grace] shall become in him a fountain of water springing up into life everlasting." At the end of the conversation Jesus is led to declare that He is the Messias. These earliest words on Christ-the-Life, like the first ones on Christ-the-Light, can well be taken in a Messianic sense and do not throw any direct light on the personality of Jesus.

But there are others to follow. John v, 20, *seq.*: "For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth Him all things which Himself doeth. . . . For as the Father raiseth up the dead and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom He will. . . . Amen, amen, I say unto you, that he who heareth My word and believeth Him that sent Me hath life everlasting. . . . For as the Father hath life in Himself, so He hath given to the Son also to have life in Himself." Here it is the Son incarnate Who is speaking, and it is as such, and in His humanity, that He has received this gift of having life (the life of grace) in Himself and of the power to bestow it on others through faith.

John vi, 35, *seq.*, must likewise be understood of the Son in His humanity: "I am the bread of life. . . . And this is the will of My Father that sent Me: that every one that seeth the Son and believeth in Him may have life everlasting. . . . I am the living bread which came down from heaven. . . . And the bread that I will give is My flesh for the life of the world. . . . As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me." This discourse, which refers to the Eucharist, certainly carries us much beyond purely Messianic conceptions. Jesus is speaking of Himself according to His human nature—in which the Father has abundantly endowed Him with His gifts—and at the same time in the character of Son. If His humanity was not that of the true Son of God it would not be possessed of such prerogatives.

All these discourses of Jesus presuppose beyond His humanity, to which they directly refer, this character of the true Son, which alone explains them.

"I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he be dead, shall live: And every one that . . . believeth in Me shall not die for ever. Believest

thou this? [Martha] saith to Him: Yea, Lord, I have believed that Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, who art come into this world" (John xi, 25, *seq.*).

"Jesus saith to him: I am the way and the truth and the life" (St. John xiv, 6). He is so according to His human nature, personally united to the Son of God, which He is; He is so—and in a higher sense—by reason of His divinity.

III.—The Father and the Son

It is upon the theme of the relations between the Father and the Son that St. John, in the body of his Gospel, throws the most light, whether he reports Jesus' own words, or whether he interprets them. His doctrine here is more in accord with that striking saying, which stands alone, reported in Matt. xi, 25, *seq.*, and Luke x, 21, *seq.*, than with St. Paul.

The saying of Jesus to Nicodemus in John iii, 12, *seq.*, strange and mysterious as it is in its wording, is none the less so in that it is given as a justification of his unique authority as revealer. "If I have spoken to you earthly things, and you believe not, how will you believe if I shall speak to you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended into heaven [and therefore knows all about it], but He that descended from heaven, the Son of man Who is [still] in heaven." (Cf. Ephes. iv, 7, *seq.*) This is the doctrine of the Incarnation affirmed somewhat disconcertingly of the Son of man and not of the Son of God—the term signifying the terminating-point replacing the term which denotes the starting-point; and in addition with the assertion of the continuing presence in heaven (in the bosom of the Father) of the Son of God Who, as Son of man, is living on earth. As it is, and for anyone who has not read the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, it has a somewhat enigmatical appearance, by

which, perhaps, Jesus meant to arouse the interest of Nicodemus, and to raise his mind above the rather superficial views and sentiments which had led him to seek this interview by night.

In the course of the discourse, in which it may be that John mingles his commentary with the actual words of Jesus, we have this elucidation: "For God sent not His Son into the world . . . because he believeth not in the name of the only begotten Son of God" (iii, 17, 18).

Here, instead of "Son of man," we find the term which we were expecting and which explains all—"Son of God," "only-begotten Son of God." Thus we meet again with the Pauline doctrine of Philip. ii, 6, *seq.* Jesus said "Son of man" because He speaks as the Incarnate Son and of the Incarnate Son.

In John iii, 31, *seq.*, the thought of Jesus is again expressed in the commentary of the Evangelist—at least, so it would seem: "He that cometh from above is above all. And what He hath seen and heard that He testifieth: and [nevertheless] no man receiveth His testimony. He that hath received His testimony hath set to His seal that God is true. For He Whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for He [viz. the One sent*] doth not give the spirit by measure."

This Envoy (He "Whom God hath sent") is, then, the Son incarnate, and it is to Him as such in His human nature that the Father has given all things. But this Son was pre-existent in heaven, whence the Father sent Him. St. John is full of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

In John v, 17, *seq.*, it is certainly Jesus Himself Who is speaking in justification of the liberty He has taken of curing the infirm man at Bethsaida on the sabbath: "My Father worketh until now, and I work. Hereupon

* The English version has: "for God . . ." (Trans.).

therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He did not only break the sabbath, but also said God was His Father, making Himself equal to God." The Jews had understood quite rightly, and Jesus is at no pains to contradict them. Rather does He assert in His reply the prerogatives bestowed by the Father on the Incarnate Son, that is to say, on the Son's human nature: "The Son cannot do anything of Himself, but what He seeth the Father doing; for what things soever He doth, these the Son also doth in like manner. For the Father loveth the Son [we are not, then, on the plane of the generation of the Son pre-existing], and sheweth Him [the Son incarnate] all things which Himself doth ['to shew' means 'to give power and mission']: and greater works than these will He shew Him [we are very decidedly in the sphere of the mission and activity of the Son incarnate], that you may wonder. For as the Father raiseth up the dead and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom He will. For neither doth the Father judge any man, but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all men may honour the Son as they honour the Father. He who honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father Who hath sent Him" (St. John v, 19, *seq.*) Cf. I John ii, 22, *seq.;* iv, 2, *seq.;* v, 1, *seq.* "Jesus," writes Père Lagrange, "accepts the equality with God of claiming which the Jews had accused Him, without any derogation from the profound submission owed to God by human nature, and without ignoring the peculiar relation to the Father in which the Son is placed by the Incarnation."*

The discourse on the Bread of Life is full of analogous sayings. Usually the reference is to the Son incarnate, but sometimes, and unexpectedly, to the Son pre-existing. "No man can come to me except the Father, Who hath sent Me, draw him, and I will raise him up at the

* *Evangile selon Saint Jean.* Paris, 1925. p. 157.

last day [at the parousia, which is not absent from the Fourth Gospel, as has been said]. It is written in the prophets: *And they shall all be taught of God.* Every one that hath heard of the Father and hath learned cometh to Me. Not that any man hath seen the Father but He Who is of* God [the Son as pre-existing, or, better, according to His divine nature, Who has not ceased, in spite of His Incarnation, to be with the Father], He hath seen the Father" (John vi, 44, *seq.*).

In John viii, 42, we have, under the usual image of a "proceeding" or "coming" or "descent," a new affirmation of the Incarnation: "For from God I proceeded and came: for I came not of myself, but He sent me." Then follows this conversation, so much the more suggestive because so concrete in form: "Abraham your father rejoiced that he might see My day: he saw it and was glad. The Jews therefore said to Him: Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham? Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I am."

At the Feast of the Dedication the Jews asked Jesus: "If Thou be the Christ tell us plainly" (John x, 24); and in Jesus' reply certain words stand out, of which the apparently ordinary context cannot weaken the overwhelming significance: "I and the Father are one" (John x, 30). "Do you say of Him Whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world: Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not. But if I do, though you will not believe Me [Myself], believe the works, that you may know and believe that the Father is in Me and I in the Father" (John x, 36, *seq.*).

These words suppose the common possession of the same unique divine nature.

There remains the last conversation of Jesus with

* Fr.: *auprès de.*

His disciples, from which we take this well-known passage: "Philip saith to Him: Lord, shew us the Father, and it is enough for us. Jesus saith to him: So long a time have I been with you and have you not known Me? Philip, he that seeth Me seeth the Father also. [Here we have the Pauline notion of the Son as the image of the Father.] How sayest thou shew us the Father? Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? The words that I speak to you I speak not of Myself. But the Father who abideth in Me, He doeth the works. Believe you not* that I am in the Father and the Father in Me?" (John xiv, 8, *seq.*). And again: "All things whatsoever the Father hath are Mine" (John xvi, 15).

The Prologue will provide us with the synthesis of these scattered portions of doctrine.

IV.—The Word

Instead of the usual term "Son," there we find "the Word"—Logos—and that is, without doubt, a new term of great value.

In chapter xix of the Apocalypse we are shewn a horseman, riding on a white horse, who bears, visibly written "on his garment and on his thigh," the title of King of Kings and Lord of Lords; but his real, but secret, name is The Word of God. Of these two names the first seems to indicate the Son of God as incarnate (and to be but a variant of Lord), while the second is that of the Son of God as pre-existing.

In the First Epistle of St. John, chap. i, 1, *seq.*, we read: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life." The verbs here used suggest that

* Fr.: "Believe me. I am," etc. (Trans.)

"the Word of life" is the designation of a person, viz. Jesus Christ.

The thought is carried further: "For the life was manifested, and we have seen and do bear witness. . . ." Of the complex formula, "the Word of Life," John now uses only one factor and not that of "the Word," but that of "the Life," which retains the character of a personal name which is suggested by the formula as a whole.

The working out of the thought and terminology is continued: "and [we] declare unto you the life eternal [here a personal name], which was with the Father and hath appeared to us." So the concept of the Word of Life is reabsorbed in that of the Life, and this in the concept of the Life eternal. We cannot but be struck by the connection which John perceives and expresses between these two terms and concepts—the Word (of God) on the one hand, and the Life—or, better, the Life eternal—on the other. And it is in God that he contemplates the two realities which correspond to them. We are given the impression that for John the more concrete, the more easily grasped, the first perceived of these two notions and realities, the Word and the Life eternal,is the second, and that his mind moves from the Life eternal to the Word, and not from the Word to Life eternal.

In the Prologue we shall find set out in the second place besides this connection between the Word and Life eternal, another between the Word and the Light, or rather, the Life and the Light. In the body of the Gospel likewise a much more considerable place is given to the Life as an endowment or attribute of the Son than to the Light. To all appearance, the mind of the Evangelist, in order to reach the notion of the Word, started from the idea of the Life and secondarily from that of the Light. At any rate, what must be held as certain is that

it did not move from the idea of the Word to those of the Life and the Light. That is to say, that he did not, in order to substitute the term Word for that of Son, begin with a direct speculation on the (intellectual) nature of God, which would have led him to the conclusion that since God can beget only through an intellectual operation, the true name of His Son is the Word. As he himself says, he started from a sensible experience resting upon the revelation and person of Jesus Christ, in the course of which the first realities he perceived were those of (eternal) Life and Light [Truth], bound up with another, that of the Son of God. Thence he was led to the idea of the Word. And how so? By a sort of fusion or synthesis of these different principles considered as existing "in the bosom of the Father," which he was brought to make by the pre-existence of the Son.

There is nothing whatever to show that John had brought in from outside this notion of the Word in order to introduce it ready-made into a system of thought which had been moulded by the revelation of Jesus Christ, the Life, the Light, and Son of God. Moreover, from what source could he have derived it and where is it to be found such as St. John presents it to us? Nowhere; neither in the philosophy of Philo nor that of the Stoics. Still, if Philoism and Stoicism did not serve him as sources, may they not, at any rate, have prompted and determined his thought? There is nothing to show it; there is not a shadow of likelihood of it, nor of any positive indication. But—it may be asked—did not the Fourth Gospel see the light at Ephesus, in the very heart of Hellenism? The latest critics are much more struck with its Jewish and Palestinian character. If it were really necessary to bring in some special determining factor apart from the "suggestions" of the Holy Spirit, it would be more

properly sought for in the thought and even in the language of the Old Testament, and perhaps quite simply in the traditional connection between the notions of life and of the Word of God, these notions being transferred in the light of the Gospel into the mystery of the relations between the Father and the Son.

The value of the Prologue lies quite specially in this—that it begins at the beginning, with the Word in God (the Son pre-existing), and leads to the Word Incarnate (Jesus Christ). So far, whether in the Pauline Epistles (except perhaps in Philip. ii, 6, and even then the person spoken of is called Christ Jesus), or in St. John's Gospel itself, our minds are always directed upward, from the Son incarnate (the only historical reality) to the Son pre-existing—from the humanity of Jesus Christ to His divinity. So it is well worth our while to follow the order of the Prologue and to seek out its exact message.

We are with God, and in the sphere of eternity: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." In the first two clauses "God" is manifestly a personal name; in the third it signifies the divine nature. Two Persons possess the one divine nature, and so to signify this nature John is obliged to use the same term that he has used with the article added to indicate the Father. The Pauline formulas which come nearest to this supreme statement are: "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature" (Col. i, 15); and "the brightness of His glory and the figure of His substance" (Heb. i, 3).

Then our attention is directed from the bosom of the Father *ad extra:* "The same [the Word] was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made." This is the same doctrine as in Col. i, 16; but St. Paul

proceeds from the office of the Son in creation to the absolute antecedence of his generation—to his eternal antecedence. Here it is the other way about.

An abrupt development takes place in verses 4 and 5: "In Him was life, and the life was the life of men; and the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it." And then follows St. John's first mention of the witness of the Baptist, in verses 6-8.

"In Him was life": here we are still in the sphere of eternity. "The light was the life of men"—with these words we begin to enter the historical sphere, but without any specification of time. The following sentence: "And the light shineth in darkness," etc.—shows that though not perhaps as yet exclusively directed to him, the thought of St. John has already arrived at Jesus Christ. The thought has moved on—without as yet any explanation as to how the Word has become Jesus Christ—under cover of these two attributes, the Life and the Light, which are common to both. On this connection of Life (eternal) and Light, we must refer to John xvii, 3: "Now this is *eternal life:* that they may *know* Thee, the only true God. . . ."; and it would not be difficult to find parallel expressions in St. Paul.

"That was the true light [that], which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world.* He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not. He came into His own [to Israel, seemingly] and His own [the Jews] received Him not. But as many as received Him [by faith] He gave them power to be made the sons of God, [that is to say] to them that believe in His name. Who are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." It is quite clear that the reference is to

* Fr.: " . . . every man, coming into the world." As in R.V. (Trans.)

Jesus Christ, but that the Evangelist introduces Him under the (implicit) name of the Word, and explicitly under his own attributes of Life and Light, as if to mark their identity more forcibly. On this "being born of God," see John iii, 3, *seq.;* I John ii, 29; iii, 9; iv, 7; v, 4, 18; and St. Paul, who lays such stress upon this regeneration in baptism.

"And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we saw His glory, the glory as it were of the only-begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth." There follows a second citation of the witness of John the Baptist.

Here, then, we are told at last how the Word became Jesus Christ, viz. by His Incarnation. This glory which is Jesus Christ's by reason of His being the only-begotten Son, this glory which He has received from the Father, is His in His human nature full of grace and truth. These two terms, grace and truth, certainly correspond to Life and Light, of which they are, as it were, the translation from the sphere of the divine nature of the Word to the sphere of His humanity.

"And of His fulness [of the fulness of His humanity] we all have received, and grace for grace. [Of His fulness.] For [if] the law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." "Grace for grace"—i.e. abundantly; but also an orderly advance is signified. We are in the very heart of the Christian economy. There is no reference to the Law, save an implied opposition. All grace comes from Jesus Christ; St. Paul said nothing stronger.

In conclusion we have this final affirmation which, while it revives the notion of the passage from the Life to the Light (which we met with in verse 4), puts aside the conception of grace and retains that of truth, and bears witness to the incarnate Word in His historical function of the one Revealer: "No man hath seen God

at any time; the only begotten Son* Who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

This conclusion is, as it were, St. John's signature. St. Paul would have found a way to lead us on to Jesus Christ as the only Redeemer. We leave St. John looking upon Jesus Christ as the only Revealer. In his Gospel, in his First Epistle many times, he speaks of the redeeming death of Christ. Cf. I John i, 7; ii, 2; iii, 5, 16; iv, 10; v, 6, *seq.* His Prologue, however—that magnificent synthesis of all that is most characteristic in his thought—has no mention of it. Between the point of view of St. Paul and that of St. John—in spite of the entire agreement between their respective doctrines—and especially between their mentality and their psychology—there is an undeniable difference. They do not put the emphasis on quite the same things; but they say the same things.

* Fr.: *Un Dieu fils unique . . .*

CHAPTER IV

THE DIVINE TRINITY

SUMMARY: I.—*The Trinitarian formulas.* II.—*The Personality of the Holy Spirit.* III.—*The relations among the Divine Persons..*

I.—THE TRINITARIAN FORMULAS

IT seems superfluous to show that for the writers of the N.T. there is but one God. Over against the surrounding polytheism, with its "vain idols," St. Paul sets this foundation of both the Jewish and Christian faith (Acts xiv, 14, *seq.;* xvii, 24; I Tim. i, 17; I Cor. viii, 4).

In this last passage, however—I Cor. viii, 4, *seq.*—the Apostle's strictly monotheistic thought is drawn out in a new fashion: "For although there be that are called gods either in heaven or on earth (for there be gods many and lords many); yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of Whom are all things and we unto Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom are all things, and we by Him." Here we have a dual formula, of which there are abundant examples throughout the N.T., and especially in St. Paul's writings. Of the two Persons who appear in it, One, the Father, is called God, the other, Jesus Christ, is entitled Lord. Now, are God and Lord equivalent terms? Yes and no. Yes for both suppose the divine nature; but the first expresses it directly, and the second by connotation, as we have

explained above; or, again, through one of its attributes —universal sovereignty—rather than in itself.

But beside these dual formulas we find also triple formulas. Jesus Himself utters one in its complete form: "Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii, 19). This triple formula is directly related to baptism, and at the same time, and in the same way, to faith. It is an essential and distinctive assertion of the Christian faith, as is this other one, with which we have already met—"Jesus is Lord."

Triple formulas of this kind are found with particular frequency in St. Paul's writings, together with dual formulas. Père Prat mentions twenty-six of them, after a thorough sifting, which has led him to reject several others usually cited. Some of those which he retains are open to question; for example: II Thess. ii, 12, 13, which is far from clear; I Thess. v, 18, 19, where *pneuma* ("spirit") might mean charisma; I Cor. ii, 10-12, where we have a dual formula, otherwise valuable. On the other hand, in a considerable number of cases we have to do not so much with formulas properly so-called as with statements more or less lengthy, in which are found the factors of a triple formula. Nevertheless, their real value is the same.

These formulas, or statements, are not always worded in exactly the same terms. We have sometimes—God, Christ (Jesus), the Spirit, as in Gal. iii, 11-14; sometimes —the Spirit, the Lord, God, I Cor. xi, 4, *seq.;* sometimes—Christ, the Spirit, the Father, Ephes. ii, 18, etc. But the difference is only one of words. "God" and "the Father" are equivalents, as is shown by the expression "God the Father." So it is, too, with the terms "Christ," "the Lord," "the Son," which we often find combined to indicate the same person. Instead of "the Spirit," we often find "the Holy Spirit," or "the Spirit of Holiness."

Outside the Pauline Epistles we should take special notice of the following formula in I Pet. i, 2: "According to the foreknowledge of God (the)* Father, unto the sanctification of (the)* Spirit, unto obedience . . . of Jesus Christ." God, Father, and Spirit are treated as if they were proper names, with which the article is not used.

The famous text, I John v, 7, according to the Vulgate, is well known: "And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost. And these three are one." From a critical point of view the circumstances of its occurrence are quite peculiar. The Holy Office has, nevertheless, declared that it is not "safe" to call in question its authenticity as Johannine; we are to understand—lightly.

Are these formulas triple or trinitarian? To be more precise: do the terms of which they are composed indicate Persons—three Persons? As to the dual formulas—"God" and "the Lord" (or "Christ"): the Father and the Son—no doubt is possible; and there is a strong presumption that the same is the case with the third term of the triple formulas—"the Spirit."

II.—The Personality of the Holy Spirit

A considerable number of critics, nevertheless, continue to doubt it. But this is to go against the weight of evidence afforded by the passages in which the term occurs, and by the expressions used to describe the Spirit's action.

In the Gospel of the Infancy the accounts of the Annunciation, in Luke i, 35, and of the appearance of the angel to Joseph (Matt. i, 18, *seq.*), attribute the virginal conception to the Holy Spirit in terms which suggest without possibility of escape that a divine Person is spoken of. The accounts of the baptism of

* There is no article in the French text, nor in the Greek. (Trans.).

Jesus, in Matt. iii, 13, *seq.*, and the parallel passages, bring together the Father, the Holy Spirit, and the Son, in such circumstances that we perceive quite clearly that we are in the presence of three Persons. The account of the Day of Pentecost in Acts ii, 1, *seq.*—especially if compared with the promises of Jesus which the descent of the Holy Ghost fulfils, and more particularly with striking passages in St. John's Gospel (xiv-xvi) referring to the Paraclete—leaves no more room for doubt that the Holy Ghost is conceived of as a divine Person.

Want of space prevents us from noticing the phrases which Jesus Himself and the New Testament writers use to express the activity of the Holy Spirit. The Book of the Acts, in particular, attributes to Him in the spreading abroad of the Gospel and in the interior life of the Church a function of the first rank; and in this He takes literally the place of Jesus Christ and appears plainly as a divine Person (Acts. iv, 31; v, 32; viii, 29; ix, 31; x, 19; xvi, 6, *seq.*, etc.). St. Paul, for his part, speaks of His dwelling and His manifold action in the baptised in terms which suppose His personality (I Cor. vi, 19; Rom. viii, 9, *seq.*). With regard to the charismata, see I Cor. xii-xiv, etc.

We need waste no more time over a demonstration which the very plainly trinitarian formula in Matt. xxviii, 19, should suffice to render superfluous. It is true that God (the Father) might seem to have an exclusive claim to divine personality;* but the Son has, by His Incarnation, made His divine personality evident, distinct from that of the Father. With regard to the Holy Spirit, no such demonstration clearly presented to our minds is afforded us; but the triple formulas that we meet with are enough to force upon us the notion of His personality. These triple formulas, which extend the double ones, are undoubtedly trinitarian. What difficulty lies

* Fr.: *pouvait sembler monopoliser la personalité divine.*

in them is to be found (especially in the Pauline passages) simply in judging whether it is the Person of the Holy Spirit or "the spirit" (which is, as the case may be, sanctifying grace or charisma) that is meant.

III.—The Relations among the Divine Persons

The order in which the divine Persons are mentioned varies very much, not only in the passages with a trinitarian content, but even in the more concise and explicit trinitarian formulas. There can be no doubt that the absolute objective order is given in Matt. xxviii, 19: ". . . in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." What is told us of their relations agrees perfectly with it. These relations may be considered from the point of view of life within the Trinity, or from the point of view of the relations of God with that which is exterior to Him.

Firstly, in the sphere of life within the Trinity, or of the interior life of God, the relations among the divine Persons, as we find them stated in the N.T., are summed up in two short formulas. The Father begets the Son, His Word. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and likewise of the Son; and this implies that He proceeds from both. Moreover, this is stated explicitly as regards the Father (John xv, 26) and implicitly as regards the Son (John xvi, 14). All goes to show that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as their mutual Love, although that is not exactly stated. The many Johannine texts which speak of the love of the Father for the Son and of the Son for the Father are to be understood, rather, of the Son incarnate (John iii, 35; v, 20; x, 17; xiv, 31; xv, 9; xvii, 23, *seq.*).

The oneness of the divine nature in the Father and the Son is perhaps more clearly expressed by the phrase: "The Father is in Me, and I in the Father" (John x, 38; xiv, 10, *seq.*, and 20; xvii, 21), than by the phrase:

"I and the Father are one [the same]" (John x, 30), which, nevertheless, seems clearly to require this interpretation. As regards the Holy Spirit, we have nothing more explicit than the statement of the unity of God.

Secondly, in the sphere of God's activity *ad extra*, we must distinguish between the order of creation and that of salvation.

In Acts xiv, 15, and xvii, 14, *seq.*, creation is attributed to God without any further determination, and so is the government of nature and of nations. But in other places the divine Persons are mentioned, at least, those of the Father and of the Son. In the Gospels providence is the work of the Father (Matt. vi, 26, and parallel passages, etc.). So is creation—I Cor. viii, 6; Heb. i, 2—but with the Son co-operating. Elsewhere—Col. i, 15, *seq.;* John i, 3, *seq.*—the creation and conservation of the world are attributed to the Son, without any explicit mention of the Father. The phrasing and the use made of the prepositions suggest, however, the idea of the co-operation of the divine Persons, and that after an order which reflects that of their relations within the Trinity.

In the sphere of salvation the matter becomes complicated by the fact of the Incarnation of the Son, which, without prejudice to the unity of His person, involves a duality of nature in Him, and therefore a double set of activities as well as of relations to the divinity. This complication affects even the sphere of creation, in respect of which we find mention by St. Paul of the Lord Jesus Christ; and even the trinitarian formulas, in which the Son incarnate appears.

But let us return to the sphere of salvation, which is that of the Incarnation. It is with reference to the Incarnation that the Father is said to "send" the Son (Rom. viii, 3; Gal. iv, 4, etc.; John iii, 17; iv, 34; v, 23, etc.). Likewise, the Father and the Son "send" or

"give" the Holy Spirit to Jesus' disciples. As to the Father, see Acts v, 32; I Thess. iv, 8; Gal. iv, 4; II Cor. i, 22; I Pet. i, 12, etc.; John xiv, 16, 26, etc. As to the Son, see John xv, 26; xvi, 7; iii, 34; Philip. i, 19.

The Son becomes incarnate, and in the human nature which He has united to Himself exercises an activity which is proper to Him; and in turn, the Father and the Holy Spirit are shown as exercising manifold activities in respect of this humanity of the Son. Thus the Father, in His eternal counsels, decrees the whole plan of salvation of which the Son is to be the faithful executant. Thus, again, the Holy Spirit has a part in the miraculous conception and the baptism of Jesus. On His part, Jesus shows the most filial obedience to the Father, and follows the impulse of the Spirit.

This doctrine of the relations which the divine Persons sustain among themselves, whether in the sphere of their life within the Trinity, or in the sphere of their action *ad extra*, with the complication which is introduced through the Incarnation of the Son, demands exact statements and distinctions which belong to rational theology.

Our task was restricted to sketching the theology of the New Testament, as regards its explicit affirmations. Even as a summary, what we offer to the careful reader is already but too closely packed for a space which must not exceed two hundred pages. At least, even if it is somewhat stiff reading, it will give him some idea of the revelation of Jesus Christ. In its evangelical and apostolic presentment that revelation escapes on every side from the limits and formulas in which attempts are made to confine it. Its homogeneity, on the one hand, is manifest; on the other hand, no less so is its transcendency.

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

For the whole work:

1. Commentaries on the books of the N.T. in the collection *Etudes bibliques:* Gabalda, Paris.
2. Commentaries on the four Gospels, in the collection *Verbum salutis:* Beauchesne, Paris.
3. LAVERGNE (R.P.)—*Synopse des quatre Evangiles:* Gabalda, Paris. 1927.
4. LEMONNYER (R.P.)—*Les épîtres de Saint Paul*, French translation. Publications Notre-Dame du Roc, Marseille. 1924.

For the Introduction:

5. LAGRANGE (R.P.)—*Le sens du Christianisme d'après l'exégèse allemande:* Gabalda, Paris. 1918.

For Part I:

6. BUZY (R.P.)—*Saint Jean-Baptiste:* Gabalda, Paris. 1922.
7. LAGRANGE (R.P.)—*Le Messianisme chez les Iuifs:* Gabalda, Paris. 1909.
8. LAGRANGE (R.P.)—*La gnose mandéenne et la tradition évangélique*, in *Revue biblique.* 1927-1928.
9. DUFOURCQ (A.)—*La Révolution religieuse, Jésus:* Plon, Paris. 6th ed. 1927.
10. LAGRANGE (R.P.)—*L'hermétisme*, in *Revue biblique.* 1924-1925.
11. DE GRANDMAISON (R.P.L.)—*Jésus dans l'histoire et dans le mystère:* Bloud et Gay, Paris. 1925.

* Only a small number of works is given, all written in French by Catholic scholars, and published recently.

12. Allo (R.P.)—*La Scandale de Jésus:* Grasset, Paris. 1927.
13. De Grandmaison (R.P.L.)—*Jésus-Christ* in the *Dictionnaire d'Apologétique*, édition d'Alès, vol. ii. Beauchesne, Paris. 1914.
14. Lebreton (R.P.)—*La Vie chrétienne au 1er siècle:* Grasset, Paris. 1927.

For Part II:

15. Prat (R.P.)—*La Théologie de Saint Paul*, 2 vols.: Beauchesne, Paris. 6th ed., 1923.
16. Duperray (J.)—*Le Christ dans la vie chrétienne d'après Saint Paul:* Giraudon, Paris. 1922.
17. Jacquier (E.)—*Mystères paiens (Les), et Saint Paul*, in the *Dictionnaire d'Apologétique*, vol. iii. 1916.
18. Allo (R.P.)—*Les dieux sauveurs du paganisme gréco-romain*, in the *Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques:* Gabalda, Paris. 1926.
19. *La synthèse du dogme eucharistique chez Saint Paul*, in the *Revue biblique*. 1921.

For Part III:

20. Cerfaux (L.)—*Le titre* Kyrios *et la dignité royale de Jésus*, in the *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*. 1922-1923.
21. Lagrange (R.P.)—*Vers le Logos de Saint Jean*, in the *Revue biblique*. 1923.
22. Lebreton (R.P.)—*Les origines du dogme de la Trinité:* Beauchesne, Paris. 2nd ed., 1927.
23. Michel (A.)—*Jésus-Christ*, in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, vol. viii, 1.: Letouzey, Paris. 1924.
24. Huby (R.P.)—*Christus:* Beauchesne, Paris. 3rd ed., 1921.
25. Lemonnyer (R.P.)—*L'Esprit-Saint* Paraclet, in the *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*. 1927.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE STANHOPE PRESS LTD.
ROCHESTER KENT

Date Due

Ap 20 '3[illegible]			
N 9 '3[illegible]			
E [illegible] '47			
N 15 [illegible]			
Ag 5 - '45			
AUG 1 '47			
AUG [illegible]			
AUG 1[illegible]			
[illegible] 15 '52			
SEP 24 '54			
JUL 28 '56			
AUG 12 '56			
MR 13 '67			
OC 1 '92			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

MARYGROVE COLLEGE
3 1927 00069621 8

225 Lemonnyer, Rev. Fr.
L54 The theology of the

225
L54